Published on the 15th of the month

Vol. XXIX, No. 3 JUNE, 1939

THE MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

EDITOR: H. D. A. MAJOR, D.D., F.S.A.

CONTENTS:

PAGE

Signs of the Times:
- The State and the Soul 113
- Doctrinaire Pacifists and Practical Pacifists 115
- Has Liberal Christianity a Future? .. 119
- Cremation and the Creeds 122

The Strength and Courage of Faith .. . 124
Bishop Henson, D.D., LL.D.

History in the Gospels 131
Canon J. S. Bezzant, B.D.

A Priestly Historian 135
J. R. McCallum, M.A.

St. Paul and the Institution of the Eucharist .. 138
P. R. Smythe, M.A., B.D.

Book Reviews:
- The Century of Crisis 141
- The Problems of the Lord's Prayer 146
- St. Paul through Modern Eyes 149
- Educational Theory and the Teacher's Art 151
- History and the Gospel 155
- God in Creation 157
- The Philanthropic Motive in Christianity .. 158
- The English Poet of Christianity 160
- The Swastika 163

Correspondence 164
Herbert Spencer and Materialism; Convocation and Cremation; Evangelism and the Film; Sir Charles Marston on Pentateuchal Criticism, &c.

OXFORD: BASIL BLACKWELL, 49 BROAD STREET

Price 1s. net. Annual Subscription, 10/6

AMERICAN AGENT:

MRS. CHARLES E. COCKEY, 1423 Linden Avenue, Baltimore, Md., U.S.A.

Entered as Second Class Matter, July 18, 1931, at the Post Office at Baltimore, Md., under the Act of March 3, 1879 (Sec. 397, P.L.& R.).

The Modern Churchmen's Union

FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF LIBERAL RELIGIOUS THOUGHT.
Inaugurated at the Church House, Westminster, October 31st, 1898.

President:
Sir CYRIL NORWOOD, D.Litt., President of St. John's College, Oxford.

Vice-Presidents:

THE MASTER OF THE TEMPLE, M.A.
The Right Hon. Lord CHARNWOOD.
The Hon. GILBERT COLERIDGE, M.A., J.P.
G. G. COULTON, Esq., D.Litt., F.B.A.
Rev. F. G. GIVEN-WILSON, M.A.
ARTHUR GRAY, Esq., M.A.
Rev. HUBERT HANDLEY, M.A. [F.B.A.
Professor S. H. HOOKE, M.A., B.D.
Very Rev. W. R. INGE, K.C.V.O., D.D.,
Rev. Prof. F. J. FOAKES JACKSON, D.D.
Sir LAWRENCE JONES, Bt., M.A.
R. W. MACAN, Esq., D.Litt.
Rev. H. D. A. MAJOR, D.D., F.S.A.
Rev. W. D. MORRISON, LL.D.
Very Rev. the DEAN OF ST. PAUL'S, K.C.V.O., D.D.
Rev. Canon H. P. PLUMPTRE, M.A.
Rev. Canon C. E. RAVEN, D.D.
Rev. KARL REILAND, D.D.
Rev. Canon T. GUY ROGERS, M.C., B.D.
THE MASTER OF CHARTERHOUSE, M.A.
Rev. Canon V. F. STORR, M.A.
Rev. F. R. TENNANT, D.D., B.Sc., F.B.A.
J. W. WALKER, Esq., M.D., O.B.E., F.S.A.
DOUGLAS WHITE, Esq., M.D.
Sir ARNOLD WILSON, M.P.

Members of the Council, 1939-40:

Chairman:

Miss A. M. ASHLEY, M.A.
Rev. K. G. BUDD, A.K.C.
Rev. G. W. BUTTERWORTH, M.A., Litt.D.
T. J. CHILDS, Esq., B.A.
E. T. ENGLAND, Esq., M.A.
Miss W. M. FAYERMAN, M.A.
Rev. P. GARDNER-SMITH, B.D.
Rev. G. L. H. HARVEY, M.A.
Miss HILDA HUBBARD.
Rev. R. G. JACKSON, B.A.
S. K. JONES, Esq., B.A.
GUY KENDALL, Esq., M.A.
Rev. T. H. H. KILBORN, B.A.
Sir A. W. LAWRENCE, Bart., M.A., J.P.
Rev. A. R. C. LEANEY, B.A.
Rev. T. H. W. MAXFIELD, M.A.
Rev. Chancellor H. G. MULLINER, M.A.
Rev. J. K. NETTLEFOLD, M.A.
Rev. R. B. PARKER, B.Sc., B.A.
Rev. F. I. L. REES, M.A.
Rev. ALAN RICHARDSON, M.A.
Rev. A. F. ROBSON, M.A.
J. H. SIMPSON, Esq., M.A.
Rev. Canon NORMAN SYKES, M.A., D.Phil.
Rev. H. J. TRUEMAN, M.A.
H. F. WALKER, Esq.
Miss DOROTHY WARD.
Rev. J. R. C. WEBB, B.D.

Office—520 GRAND BUILDINGS, TRAFALGAR SQUARE, W.C.2.
Organizing Secretary—Rev. T. J. WOOD, M.A., St. John's Vicarage, 384 Clapham Road, [S.W.9.
Assistant Secretary—Miss DOWELL.
Hon. Treasurer—Sir JOHN BARRAN, Bart., Sawley Hall, Ripon.
Bankers—MIDLAND BANK, METHODIST HALL BRANCH, S.W.1.

AIMS OF THE MODERN CHURCHMEN'S UNION

1.—To affirm the progressive character of God's self-revelation, and the certainty that no truth can lead away from Him.
2.—To proclaim Christ and His Gospel in the light of modern knowledge, endeavouring to give a clear meaning to all phrases which are open to ambiguous treatment.
3.—To maintain the right and duty of the Church of England to reject what is false and to restate what is true in her traditional dogmas.
4.—To defend the freedom of responsible students, clerical as well as lay, in their work of criticism and research.
5.—To promote the study of the Bible according to modern critical methods, and to interpret its message in the light of such study.
6.—To secure more regard for beauty and truth in Church Services and the use of language and customs in harmony with modern thought.
7.—To promote the application of Christian principles in public as well as in private life.
8.—To assert the right and duty of the laity to take a due share in the government and work of the Church.
9.—To maintain the historic comprehensiveness of the Church of England and to foster fellowship and co-operation in Word and Sacrament with other Christian Societies.

Annual Subscription.—Members, at least 10/-; Associates, 2/6; Life Membership, £10. Cheques should be made payable to The Modern Churchmen's Union, and crossed 'Midland Bank, Wesleyan Hall, S.W.1.'

All communications as to membership, subscriptions, changes of address, and business matters should be sent to—

The Organizing Secretary, Modern Churchmen's Union, 520 Grand Buildings, W.C.2.

THE

MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

A State without the means of change is without the means of its conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

No. 3. JUNE, 1939. Vol. XXIX.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES

The State and the Soul.

The menace to personal liberty even in this free land in the twentieth century is the theme of Dr. St. John Ervine's Essex Lecture, entitled *The State and the Soul.** Perhaps the bravest declaration of British freedom was made by Dr. Magee, Archbishop of York, when in the course of a debate on the drink problem he declared that he had rather see 'England free than England sober.' Dr. St. John Ervine does not cite Dr. Magee, but Lord Morley, to indicate how much our British faith in freedom has declined in recent years. John Morley wrote in 1874:

> 'The right of thinking freely and acting independently, of using our minds without excessive awe of authority, and shaping our lives without unquestioning obedience to custom, is now a finally accepted principle in some sense or another with every school of thought that has the smallest chance of commanding the future.'

How has the tide of freedom receded since those days! Freedom is still enjoyed in this country although threatened by Fascist and Communist tyranny. It also survives in the other great democracies, but it is assuredly menaced—menaced by systems whose protagonists disguise themselves as angels of

* *The State and the Soul.* By St. John Ervine. (The Lindsey Press. 1s. 1939.)

light. Tyranny proclaims itself as the friend of social morality, sound citizenship, effective organization, scientific regulation, essential justice, without which civilization must collapse and progress pass into retrogression. The lamentation of poor Mme. Roland facing the guillotine, 'Oh Liberty, Liberty, what evils are wrought in thy name!' is now the slogan of a steadily increasing number of the dictators, great and little, of our world-states. Dr. St. John Ervine affirms that there are to-day five communities with which we are in close contact which claim 'to control the mind of the community for the community's general welfare.' These are the Roman Catholic Church, the Soviet Government of Russia, the Nazi Government of Germany, the Fascist Government of Italy, and the De Valeran Government of the Irish Free State. We need not cite illustrations of this policy pursued by the first four communities named: evidence for it is too well known. In the case of the Irish Free State, however, Dr. St. John Ervine asserts:

> 'Mr. De Valera will not permit the publication or advertisement in his part of Ireland of any book which mentions birth control, even if it does so only to denounce it' (p. 19).

Diderot wrote nearly two hundred years ago:

> 'Keeping slaves is nothing; what is so intolerable is that slaves should be kept and given the name of citizen.'

We are all to-day theoretically convinced that the slavery of individuals is a monstrous injustice to the enslaved and a moral and economic injury to those who enslave them. But if the State be the enslaver and the citizen the slave, there is a growing number of people who maintain that the policy is not only necessary but beneficial. Some will exclaim, 'What! a benefit to the citizen as well as to the State?' To this the modern dictator replies, 'It is unnecessary to consider the citizen; he exists only as a part of the State and for the State. He is entitled to no independent existence of his own, nor to any interests except those of the State.' Individualism, we are told, has run riot. Personal liberty has become licence, even licentiousness. Hence in the latest socialist gospel we see tyranny, like some Car of Juggernaut, crushing personal freedom out of existence. It may do it in the name of religion and morality, as does the Roman Church, or in the name of national safety, prosperity and pres-

tige, as do the dictators of Germany and Italy, but what this policy inevitably ends in is stagnation. Such is the conclusion at which Dr. St. John Ervine arrives:

> 'Those who disbelieve in personal liberty, which is the efflorescence of a gracious spirit, and would substitute for it a system of society in which the life of the individual is closely regulated from the cradle to the grave, the grave being brought prematurely near to the restive and disobedient, will, if they succeed in their design, eventually find themselves faced with the problem of saving their State from stagnation.'

Many of our leaders who had no strong convictions as to the relation of our civilization to the Christian religion, nor had realized how intimately the two are interwoven, are now awakening to the reality of this relationship. Such an awakening demands as a preliminary sound answers to the questions: What essentially is Christianity? And what essentially is civilization? We would answer both questions by asserting that all Christianity worthy of the name demands a growing devotion to the spirit of love, truth and freedom, and that these values also constitute the distinguishing features of our British civilization. And of these three the first, if not the greatest, is freedom. With this conclusion Dr. St. John Ervine concurs:

> 'If, however, the State, having established an absolute authority over the minds and bodies and spirits of its citizens, forbids any communication other than what it considers good, there must inevitably come about a decline in mental and spiritual activity. The community which decrees the slavery of its citizens, decrees its own death. There was no healing in the Pool of Bethesda until *after* the angel had troubled the waters. Rudolf Eucken, whom we may regard as a greater German than Herr Hitler, remarked in one of his works, *Can We Still be Christians?* "We not only can be, but we must be Christians; only, however, if we recognize that Christianity is a progressive, historical development, still in the making"' (p. 45).

Doctrinaire Pacifists and Practical Pacifists.

In Great Britain to-day we are all lovers of peace, but we have discovered that there are two kinds of pacifists: doctrinaire pacifists and practical pacifists. This important distinction is recognized and emphasized by Dr. Lindsay, the Master of Balliol, in his Burge Memorial Lecture for 1939, *Pacifism as a Principle and Pacifism as a Dogma.** Both classes of pacifists

* *Pacifism as a Principle and Pacifism as a Dogma.* By A. D. Lindsay, C.B.E., LL.D., Master of Balliol College, Oxford. (S.C.M. Press. 1939. Price 6*d*.)

are striving each in their own way to deserve the beatitude of Jesus, 'Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the children of God.' But the practical pacifists hold that force may be used to maintain international peace, whereas the doctrinaire pacifists are convinced that force may not be used for that purpose.

Neither type of pacifist can secure the support of Jesus against the other. Jesus taught nothing about international peace and the use or non-use of force to maintain it. His exhortation 'Resist not him that is evil' refers to personal enemies. His prediction that they that take the sword shall perish by the sword is directed against the zealot movement in Judaism which sought to overthrow Roman imperialism by armed rebellion. In neither case is the teaching of Jesus directly concerned with foreign relations and how to maintain peace and justice among the nations of the world. Hence Jesus cannot be rightly cited as supporting the doctrinaire pacifists rather than the practical pacifists.

Dr. Lindsay finds as the result of a wide experience that international peace-workers, not all of them necessarily international peace-makers, fall roughly into two classes — pacifists for whom pacifism is a principle and pacifists for whom pacifism is a dogma. Those for whom pacifism is a dogma are more concerned with the methods to secure peace than with the result. The dogmatic pacifists will on no account permit the use of force to maintain international peace. The practical pacifist does not exclude the use of force as the means for securing or maintaining peace. Force for him is in itself neither good nor bad: the purpose for which it is used and the way in which it is used make it good or bad. For the maintenance of civil peace force is used; and were it not used, a law-abiding, peace-loving majority in any community would quickly find itself and its possessions at the mercy of criminals and lunatics.

Even in the sphere of education, although in a less degree, force has its use, and the maintenance of the discipline necessary to secure an atmosphere helpful to attention and diligence would, in many cases, become impossible if it were not known that force will be used when other appeals have proved ineffective. The use of force is, like the appeal to fear, a remedy

which may alone be used when resort to other remedies has failed. The motto 'ultima ratio regum' ('the last argument of sovereigns') inscribed on some of the enemy's artillery captured in the Great War has, in certain circumstances, its justification.

On various historic occasions this last and worst argument has been used as a peace maker, a preserver of a people's freedom, a destroyer of tyranny, a protector of the weak and helpless, a vindicator of justice, and even a defender of civilization itself. It was the most prophetic and courageous of American poets, Lowell, who wrote:

> 'Civilization does git forrard,
> Sometimes upon a powder cart.'

War, under modern conditions, makes enormous demands upon the courage, self-sacrifice, intelligence, faith, fortitude, unyielding resolution, self-discipline and social unity of that nation which, after all other efforts and appeals have failed, resorts to it in the interests of freedom, righteousness and humanity. Such a nation, however, may rightly claim to be pacifist in the sense that it is wholly devoted to the maintenance and furtherance of those ultimate conditions of human society by which alone peace based upon morality can be secured. This, we believe, correctly expresses the Master of Balliol's conviction.

Dr. Lindsay is utterly opposed to doctrinaire pacifism. This doctrinaire pacifism, where it is sincere, unselfish and heroic—not where, as in some cases, it is hypocritical, cowardly and selfish—lacks realism and practicality. So far from maintaining peace, it would plunge the race into anarchy and enslave it to violence, tyranny and injustice. Of it Dr. Lindsay writes:

> 'One of the greatest dangers to peace in Europe in this past year has been the pursuance in this country of what we call doctrinaire pacifism' (p. 9).

The doctrinaire pacifist will regard Dr. Lindsay as an apostate and a traitor to the pacifist cause.

The doctrinaire pacifist may speak of war as hell and compare righteous wars to the attempt of Satan to cast out Satan; but the policy which he proposes instead of war, in the face of unrighteous aggression, does not make the doctrinaire pacifist a peace-maker, but an encourager of lawlessness and anarchy. Unjust wars are hell, but a just war may prove to be purgatory

for the unrighteous aggressor. Those who resist unrighteous aggression by force when all appeals to the rational and moral conscience of their adversaries have failed are, we believe, entitled to claim for themselves the Beatitude which Jesus pronounced on the peacemakers.

Some Modernists are doctrinaire pacifists; other Modernists are practical pacifists. An open-minded study of the Master of Balliol's essay should do much to bring them into agreement. The difference between them is, we believe, fundamentally the difference between Idealists and Realists. To the idealists Dr. Lindsay addresses this serious word of warning:

> 'Much harm can easily be done by the laying down, as if it were law, of an ideal rule of conduct which is not kept: far better is it to lay down a less ideal rule which is kept. To have ideal rules which are not kept is really not to have rules but anarchy, with all the evil consequences of anarchy. The idealist forces of the country spend themselves over an illusion and the evil forces have their way. As a cynic remarked of prohibition in America: "Both sides are satisfied. The drys have the law and the wets have the drink"' (p. 27).

On the other hand, the realist pacifist cannot be too conscious of the awful responsibility involved in making war in the cause of non-aggression. Resort to the destructive and terrorist forces of war, after the appeal to reason and conscience has failed, is a descent to a lower level in which the sub-human and brutal passions of men can gain the ascendancy with fatal facility. Those engaged in war on behalf of even the best causes must feel some sense of guilt in such an undertaking. The community which executes a murderer should feel no satisfaction, still less exhilaration. If its moral consciousness is as sensitive as it ought to be, the community should feel that in some measure it shares the guilt of the crime which it punishes. Its failure has compelled it to choose the lesser of two evils, the execution of a murderer rather than the encouragement of murder by lack of severity. But compared with the prevention of murder by means of sound education and the right social environment, which is the only policy which can ultimately be commended, execution is a confession by the community of moral failure and of the guilt which goes with that failure.

So, also, the international situation which demands war, if freedom and righteousness are to be preserved, points to the

existence of a moral situation which, if it is to be rightly and permanently remedied, needs greater forces than those of war to accomplish it — forces which are inherent in the Christian religion, if rightly understood and practised.

Has Liberal Christianity a Future?

Professor Gilbert Murray in his recent address to the Oxford University Liberal Club stressed the deplorable weakness of Liberalism in English politics to-day. Those who recall the Liberal gospel as proclaimed by the great Liberal leaders, J. S. Mill, W. E. Gladstone, John Morley and Lord Asquith, with its faith in education, freedom, progress, democracy, may well marvel at the present situation of the Liberal Party as a political power, and search anxiously for the cause of its downfall. We are not a political journal, and are therefore compelled to resist the temptation to deal with this problem. Nevertheless, although the Liberal Party as a political organization may have collapsed, the gifts which Liberalism imparted to our British Commonwealth of Nations have not been lost. We are enjoying them in no small measure at the present time and they constitute the mainspring of our social and political policies. If the Liberal Party be in doleful dumps, it is because other political organizations have stolen its thunder and strive to disguise the robbery by speaking contemptuously of Liberalism.

Something similar has taken place in the world of religion. Liberal theology and Liberal religion in the days before the Great War were certainly in the ascendant in the Christian world of North-western Europe and Northern America. It is true that the numerical adherents of this movement were few, but their influence was great and growing. Its leaders possessed the optimism of men marching into the Dawn. To-day Liberal Christianity is spoken of with contempt; as something which is as discredited as it has proved itself to be futile. The Liberal Gospel, the Liberal Jesus and the Liberal God are derided, and the theologies of Neo-Thomism, Neo-Calvinism, Neo-Lutheranism are claimed as infinitely more deserving of faith and obedience. Liberal theology undoubtedly had its limitations. Loisy on the one hand, and Schweitzer on the other, criticized these

limitations effectively. When the Great War came, the Anglo-Catholic and Evangelical Press in England seized the opportunity to assail Liberal Christian theology as 'Theology made in Germany,' apparently forgetting the existence in France of Auguste Sabatier and the Fidei-Symbolist school, and in English-speaking lands the existence of such Liberal scholars as William Robertson Smith, Estlin Carpenter, Edwin Hatch, J. F. Hort, Sanday, Burkitt, Streeter, and a galaxy of American critics and theologians who, while in large agreement with German Liberal scholarship, were in some respects both independent and critical of it.

Like all great movements, the Liberal Christian movement had its defects and weaknesses and its injudicious followers. It was too optimistic and too ready to believe that the Kingdom of God would immediately appear; it had too strong a belief in the essential goodness and reasonableness of human nature; it lacked confidence in ecclesiastical organizations and institutions as divine instruments for bringing in the Kingdom of God, and as a consequence neglected both to support and reform them. Its axioms—'We needs must love the highest when we see it'; 'God's in His heaven; all's right with the world'; '*Vox populi, vox Dei*,' and so on—are seen to-day to have been more sentimental than sensible. They failed to recognize a number of very important countervailing considerations. For instance, that human beings, although children of God, are also inheritors of a brute ancestry. Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler stressed this in his fine volume *The Faith of a Liberal*:

> 'The Liberal leans too heavily upon reason and reasonableness, and in so doing often overlooks the tremendous power of those human instincts, reactions and emotions which effectively exclude reason from their immediate control. The modern psychologist reveals in his studies a human mind that is a much more complicated thing than it was once thought to be. All sorts of hidden and suppressed tendencies are at work in it and upon it. Past generations and long-forgotten experiences have left their mark there. When the Liberal calls upon reason to lead, the answer is too often only a mocking cry from instinct and appetite and fear.'

Nevertheless, the contribution of Liberal Christianity to religious truth, religious enlightenment, religious freedom and moral progress has been immense. Moreover the most eminent

of those who to-day speak scornfully of Religious Liberalism show many signs of having gained much from it; they stand like pygmies on the shoulders of the Liberal giants.

The debt of Modernism to Christian Liberalism is great indeed. Neither in Old Testament criticism nor in New Testament criticism, nor in theology nor in religious psychology, did Liberal Christian scholars utter the last word; but the greatest of them were aware of this. No class of religious thinkers and teachers were more aware than they, that:

> 'Our little systems have their day;
> They have their day and cease to be:
> They are but broken lights of Thee,
> And Thou, O Lord, art more than they.'

What is needful to-day if the Church is to recover strength is not that it should be less loyal to Liberal principles but that it should be more loyal to them, and seek to apply those principles with a vigour and courage with which they have not yet been applied in our Church's preaching, practice and policy. Religious Liberalism has hitherto been in our Church only the treasure of a small and select body whose influence has depended upon the quality of their message, not upon the authority of high ecclesiastical office.

The great days of Liberal Christian theology and Liberal Church policy are not passed: they are yet to come. At present, however, those who might be won by them to conscious Christian loyalty have ceased to be practising members of the Christian Churches. This is due to two causes: (1) the clericalist opposition to Liberalism within the Church, and (2) the failure of Christian Liberals to use the Church as the chief instrument of their mission and message.

It was the weakness of Christian Liberalism, as it is to-day of Modernism, that it was content to think of itself only as an orientation, a spirit, an attitude, an outlook, and not as also a driving force which must work with untiring, self-sacrificing energy in and through the Christian Church, and embody itself in Christian institutions, old and new, here and now, reshaping them to meet the needs of the future.

Cremation and the Creeds.

In the recent debate in Convocation on cremation, as reported in the *Church Times* of May 26, the claims of traditional phraseology in affirming the Christian faith in a future life were stubbornly maintained. The Bishop of Norwich, in presenting the report of a Joint Committee on Cremation, stated that the committee recommended the use of the Prayer Book's Burial Service in cases where the body had been cremated.

In the discussion which followed the Bishop of Birmingham proposed that the words 'personal immortality' should be substituted for the 'resurrection of the body' in the Burial Service, on the ground that 'resurrection of the body' reflected the old idea that the dead body would be reconstituted to be the vehicle of the soul in the life to come.

> 'The Bishop of London opposed Dr. Barnes, for the reasons that the phrase to which he objected occurred in the Creeds, and that its substitution in the resolution might be misunderstood and have a reflex action on belief in our Lord's Resurrection and in the Empty Tomb.
>
> The Archbishop of Canterbury also insisted that the mere words "personal immortality" did not convey by that phrase all that the Christian who believed in the Creeds meant, and asked why they, as Bishops, should hesitate to use words consecrated by their Creeds.'

The Bishop of Birmingham's amendment was lost.

The traditionalists who insisted upon the retention of the phrase 'resurrection of the body' because it had credal authority behind it seem to have ignored the fact that two other phrases, 'the resurrection of the flesh' and 'the resurrection of the dead,' are also authorized by our Prayer Book Creeds. All students of the Creeds know that 'the resurrection of the flesh' is much the oldest, and therefore presumably, for traditionalists, the most authoritative. Our Anglo-Saxon forbears professed their belief in the '*Agenrisyng of fleisch*.' Surely a consistent traditionalism ought to require us to use this phrase to-day. On the other hand, the phrase 'the resurrection of the dead' has the authority behind it of our great Ecumenical Creed, which expresses the dogmatic formulations achieved by the first four General Councils.

But for the Church of England the primary authority is Scripture, not the Creeds. Article VIII affirms that the three

Creeds ought 'to be received and believed: for they may be proved by most certain warrants of holy Scripture.' Of the three phrases, 'resurrection of the flesh,' 'resurrection of the body,' and 'resurrection of the dead,' it is the third which is scriptural. This was stressed by our English philosopher, John Locke, to Bishop Stillingfleet:

> 'The resurrection of the dead I acknowledge to be an article of the Christian faith: but that the resurrection of the same body, in your Lordship's sense of the same body, is an article of the Christian faith, is what, I confess, I do not yet know. In the New Testament (wherein, I think, are contained all the articles of the Christian faith) I find our Saviour and the apostles to preach the *resurrection of the dead* and the *resurrection from the dead,* in many places. But I do not remember any place where the *resurrection of the same body* is so much as mentioned: nay, what is very remarkable in the case, I do not remember, in any place of the New Testament (where the general resurrection of the last day is spoken of), any such expression as the *resurrection of the body,* much less of the *same* body.'
>
> 'I must not part with this article of the resurrection, without returning my thanks to your Lordship for making me take notice of a fault in my Essay. When I writ that book, I took it for granted, as I doubt not but many others have done, that the Scripture had mentioned, in express terms, the resurrection of the body: but upon the occasion your Lordship has given me, in your last letter, to look a little more narrowly into what revelation has declared concerning the resurrection, and finding no such express words in Scripture as that "the body shall rise, or be raised, or the resurrection of the body," I shall, in the next edition of it, change these words of my book, "the dead bodies of men shall rise," into those of Scripture, "the dead shall rise.'

Perhaps when our Episcopate, like John Locke, has looked 'a little more narrowly' into the matter they may be induced to authorize the phrase 'resurrection of the dead' to be used in our Burial Service instead of 'resurrection of the body.' Although the phrase 'personal immortality' expresses accurately the belief of educated Christians, yet it has not behind it the authority of Christian usage possessed by the words 'the resurrection of the dead,' and for that reason we think that under present circumstances the 'resurrection of the dead' is to be preferred.

THE STRENGTH AND COURAGE OF FAITH*

By the Right Reverend Bishop Henson, D.D., LL.D.

'Let not your heart be troubled: ye believe in God, believe also in me.'
—*St. John* xiv. 1.

THESE words, which the Fourth Evangelist places in the mouth of the Master at the crisis of His earthly fate, when, in full view of Calvary, He addresses 'last words' to a company of perplexed and sorrow-laden disciples, have brought strength and comfort to believers in time of trouble through the many ages of Christian History. If we desired to find one passage in the Gospels which, beyond any other, is dear to the Christian heart, could we choose any other than this which I have read to you as my text—'Let not your heart be troubled: ye believe in God, believe also in me'?

The words disclose the historic order of religious development. First, the belief in God gained by Israel in a national covenant, and then the belief in Jesus as the perfect expression of that Jewish belief, its confirmation and its consummation, gained by His disciples in a Catholic fellowship. First, Theism, rooted in a sound philosophy, uniting the witness of conscience and the conclusion of reason in the affirmation of Faith; and then 'the Truth as it is in Jesus,' assuming, confirming, and fulfilling the older truth of Theism, 'Ye believe in God, believe also in me.'

Two consequences would seem to follow from a deliberate acceptance of the religion which presents Christianity as the true version of Theism, and to these I would beg to invite your careful consideration to-day. First, if we do verily believe in God as certified by the human conscience, and demanded by the human reason, we can never despair of Christianity, however adverse the aspect of the world may be. Next, if we do verily

*A sermon preached in St. Margaret's, Westminster, at the annual Corporate Communion of the Modern Churchmen's Union on Wednesday, May 17th, 1939.

believe in God, as fully manifest in Jesus, we cannot tolerate insincerity in our profession of discipleship. No plausible casuistry of compromise, no plea of sentiment or mere expediency, will suffice to authenticate to us anything that is seen to be untrue and unreal. Let these two propositions suffice for the heads of my present discourse.

(1) Christianity is indestructible because it is rooted in the very nature of man. Tertullian's famous description of the human soul as naturally Christian still commands respectful attention even from thinkers who would not for themselves accept the Christian name. The time-honoured distinction between natural and revealed religion is seen to be more misleading than helpful, for 'the spirit of man is the candle of the Lord,' and therefore it must follow that religion, rightly so called, must be both natural and revealed. It is natural because only as endorsed by the natural faculties of reason and conscience can it be apprehended by man; and it is revealed since, apart from the approaches of the Divine Spirit, the human faculties, ethical and rational, could not suffice to communicate or sustain it.

Those who in their conduct of human affairs would ignore or destroy religion are flying in the face of Nature, and, since confessedly Christianity is the highest version of religion — the only version, probably, which can command the acceptance of modernly civilized mankind — to stamp out Christianity is to do violence to human nature itself. We are witnessing what is perhaps the most determined and intelligent effort ever made to organize society apart from religion, and, in so far as that effort is being made within the confines of historic Christendom, to de-Christianize human life. Its apparent and rapid success, notably in Russia and Germany, has undoubtedly created much doubt and dismay in considering Christian minds. To such, then, the words of the text carry a message which is relevant and encouraging, 'Let not your heart be troubled: ye believe in God, believe also in me.' Christ is not without His witnesses even now. The steady courage of Pastor Niemöller in the concentration camp, into which the cynical cruelty of the persecutor has thrust him, prophesies the overthrow of the tyranny under which he suffers. Who can thank God enough for the faithful testimony of this brave man? I believe that the general con-

science is already anticipating the verdict of history:

> Servant of God, well done; well hast thou fought
> The better fight, who single hast maintain'd
> Against revolted multitudes the cause
> Of truth, in word mightier than they in arms;
> And for the testimony of Truth hast borne
> Universal reproach, far worse to bear
> Than violence, for this was all thy care,
> To stand approved in sight of God, though worlds
> Judged thee perverse.

The essential superiority of the moral factor in human affairs is implied in the belief in God as the Author of the Moral Law, which is His manifested Will. History is seen to be the arena of Divine activity, and men are drawn into an eternal conflict as the allies or opponents of their Creator. This reading of human experience redeems it from the fatiguing futility of unceasing and unintelligible mutation, and charges it with eternal significance. 'I see that all things come to an end, but Thy commandment is exceeding broad,' says the psalmist; and the Christian apostle interprets the paradoxes of time by the key of theistic faith: 'The world passeth away and the lust thereof, but he that doeth the will of God abideth for ever.' Here is the spring of a courage which no terrestrial adversity can crush, against which the powers of evil dash themselves in vain. 'Therefore,' sings the psalmist in the reasonable confidence of his creed, 'will we not fear, though the earth be moved and though the hills be carried into the midst of the sea. . . . The Lord of Hosts is with us: the God of Jacob is our refuge.' 'This is the victory that hath overcome the world, even our faith,' says the Apostle.

(2) To believe in God as the Author and Vindicator of the Moral Law is to accept sincerity as the very essence of religion and to repudiate as intrinsically profane every plea for compromise with falsehood in His service, Who is the very Truth itself. A relentless sincerity is demanded by His character. 'For the Word of God is living and active, and sharper than any two-edged sword, and piercing even to the dividing of soul and spirit, of both joints and marrow, and quick to discern the thoughts and intents of the heart. And there is no creature that is not manifest in His sight: but all things are naked and laid open before the eyes of Him with whom we have to do.'

Here we begin to come in sight of the practical difficulties. The high service of Truth, to which as religious men we are committed, is to be rendered in a world which is penetrated through and through with falsehood. The god of this world has been fitly called in the Bible 'the father of lies.' He that would be the servant of Truth must brace himself for a truceless and unending conflict. And on two fronts, for the external enemy can always count on a domestic ally. 'We are betrayed by what is false within.' And therefore, all through the centuries, God's service has been a *via dolorosa* lighted by martyrs' pyres. He, the Truth Incarnate, wears a crown of thorns and 'reigns from the tree.'

'We have the treasure in earthen vessels,' says St. Paul, rather sadly. At every turn the imperfection of the medium obstructs the Divine light which only by its means may give guidance to the world. To the natural infirmity of individuals, ignorance, prejudice, limited powers of mind and body, hostile circumstance, must be added the characteristic defects of institutions, defects then most of all apparent when the interests they affect are most precious. The 'salt of Christ's religion' may, in the hands of His representatives, 'lose its savour.'

The Church of England is sometimes called the Church of the *Via Media*, by which is meant that it is committed, by its history, and by the natural idiosyncrasy of the English people, to the difficult venture of 'keeping the mean between two extremes,' avoiding the blind loyalty of natural conservatism, on the one side, and the precipitate receptivity of the equally natural appetite for innovation, on the other. In the most famous of English political essays, the great Lord Halifax described the Church of England as 'a trimmer between the frenzy of fanatic visions and the lethargic ignorance of Popish dreams.' Less friendly observers have pictured the Church of England as presenting the modern equivalent of that Church of Laodicea which was condemned as lukewarm and self-satisfied. 'I would thou wert cold or hot. So because thou art lukewarm, and neither hot nor cold, I will spew thee out of my mouth.' It will be sufficient if we content ourselves with the admission that there are special risks and temptations attaching to membership in a Church which can justly claim to be the Church of the *Via Media*.

Ever since the Reformation compelled the Church of England to accept organization as a National Church, and, as such, to require from the clergy subscription to its distinctive formularies of doctrine, discipline and worship, there has been restiveness among the clergy on the subject of the extent and character of the obligation implicit in their legal subscription. For reasons which I need not elaborate, since I may assume that you are well acquainted with them, this restiveness has within recent years become greater, and now creates a situation of such difficulty as demands effective action. We may observe that there has been a steady progress towards theological liberalism in the Church of England for at least two generations. The Clerical Subscription Act of 1865, the Revision of the so-called 'Authorized Version' of the Bible, of which the New Testament was published in 1881, the unhappily abortive Revision of the Prayer Book in 1928, and now the Report of the Archbishops' Committee on Doctrine this year, may fairly be said to mark successive advances towards a modernized version of the Christian tradition.

Give me leave to make a few observations on the Report of the Archbishops' Commission on Doctrine in the Church of England. I must confess to some uncertainty as to the character and purpose of a document which must be allowed to be extremely interesting and important. It can hardly be regarded as in any sense official, but certainly, in view of its origin and the personnel of its authors, it cannot but be regarded as highly authoritative. It gives us the most trustworthy picture which we possess of the situation within the Church of England at the present time. It is certainly a very surprising and, in my judgment, a very reassuring picture. Even if we omit those matters on which the Commissioners confess that they were unable to agree, and take account only of their unanimous conclusions, we cannot but be impressed by the extent of their departure from the orthodox tradition.

A single instance will suffice. When the Commissioners reject 'the tradition of the inerrancy of the Bible' and 'detailed prediction of facts especially as concerns the life of Christ,' they conflict with the general teaching of the Church in all ages, with the teaching of the canonical writers, and with the recorded

teaching of Christ Himself. But to touch the Scriptures is to touch the Creeds, which, as the VIIIth Anglican Article teaches, are 'thoroughly to be received and believed' precisely on the ground that 'they may be proved by most certain warrants of Holy Scripture.' Criticism of the Old Testament had agitated the Church by its effect on the first section of the Creed: criticism of the New Testament is agitating the Church by its effect on the second. Not the method of creation is now in debate, but the method of re-creation or redemption. Inevitably, therefore, the conflict turns on the miracles which are alleged to have marked the birth and resurrection of the Redeemer. Both purport to be historical facts; that is, facts certified to be such by historical testimony. There are many facts which cannot be so certified, but these, however firmly persuaded we may be of their occurrence, we do not properly describe as historical. It can hardly be reasonably denied that, in the judgment of the most competent Biblical scholars who agree with the Archbishops' Commissioners in adopting 'the critical method and outlook,' the evidence for the Virgin Birth and the Physical Resurrection is not adequate, and therefore it follows that as historical facts they cannot rightly be affirmed. They belong to the category of pious opinions or theological inferences, not to that of history.

When Mr. Chavasse, in his opening address to the Oxford Conference of Evangelical Churchmen, said that 'the inspired writings of the New Testament' taught 'the Cradle at Bethlehem and the Empty Tomb' (by which he meant the Virgin Birth and the Physical Resurrection) 'beyond all shadow of doubt,' he was using the language of reckless exaggeration, and, at the same time, avoiding the problem which modern criticism of the New Testament cannot but raise, *viz.* how to reconcile the Birth narratives with the rest of the New Testament and how to harmonize the divergent statements about the Resurrection. The Archbishops' Commissioners, whom Mr. Chavasse censures, took a juster view. With commendable frankness they admit that both the traditional and the critical views were represented in their own company, as they are notoriously represented in the Church. They were unable to agree on a formula which should harmonize them, but it is not unreasonable to suppose that their Report indicates that in their judgment both views may rightly

co-exist within the Church of England. A reverent agnosticism may be allowed to extend to the methods of the Incarnation and the Resurrection. The essential truth would be as fully expressed if, instead of the phrase 'born of the Virgin Mary,' the Creed said, with St. Paul, 'born of a woman.'

Neither the Virgin Birth nor the Physical Resurrection of Christ is challenged because it implies what is called a 'miracle,' but only because it is not adequately sustained by the Scripture which is confessedly the only evidence for its historical character which the Church can offer. The Incarnation is, as the Report says, 'the central truth of the Christian Faith.' It is the source of Christian strength and the never-failing spring of Christian hope—'Ye believe in God; believe also in me.' It is taught by the Church, and proved by the Bible. This 'central truth' was variously understood in the age of the Apostles. The New Testament registers those variations. The rapidity with which knowledge has accumulated within recent years has undoubtedly created a dangerous chasm between the language of the Creeds and the thought of educated Christians. To some extent this chasm has been bridged by the silent transformation of meaning which the language of the Creeds has sustained. The Report of the Archbishops' Commission may suffice to show that this method of relieving the tension is not adequate, and that nothing short of an explicit acknowledgment of dissentient belief will satisfy the consciences of those devout and educated Anglicans, as well clergy as laity—there cannot possibly be tolerated any difference between them, for there cannot be two measures of essential truth, two standards of necessary belief in a Christian Church—whose acceptance of the Creed is perforce conditioned by their study of the Scripture. They, not less than their more technically orthodox fellow-members of the Church of England, would accord with the Commissioners' conclusion

> 'that neither can the truth of the Gospel stand unimpaired, nor can any adequate account of its origin be given, unless the broad tradition concerning Jesus, to which the Gospels and the Church have borne witness through the centuries, is accepted as historical, and in particular unless it is possible for the Church to proclaim that in the historical figure of Jesus of Nazareth "the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us."'

HISTORY IN THE GOSPELS*

By Chancellor J. S. Bezzant, B.D., Canon Residentiary of Liverpool.

IN theological studies, as in everything else, fashions change. Long years of careful investigation of 'the Gospels as historical documents' reach provisional conclusions not wholly satisfactory, but beyond which there seems no obvious way of further fruitful advance, whereon interest tends to shift from historical studies, for example, to dogmatics. This may be significant to psychologists, historians of theology and to personal biographers, but is not of much importance and is of small value to those whose main desire is for the largest measure of truth available in studies fundamental to historical Christianity. These students try to discover new methods of approach. In our time the most interesting of such new methods are those of the 'Form-critics.'

To many whose studies in the Gospels began with a thorough grounding in the documentary analyses of the Synoptic problem and in 'the higher criticism' associated with them, to turn to the literature of 'Form-criticism' seems to be a passing from a relative objectivity into a world of subjective guesswork and far-fetched analogies, often mistaken for reasonably-grounded argument. Prof. Scott is of this company. As the outline of a picture may be lost in a minute scrutiny of its details, so the Gospel story, similarly treated, tends to become a collection of meaningless fragments. It is the purpose of this book to emphasize considerations of a general character, very relevant to the question of the credibility of the Gospel record, and which Dr. Scott has found to be almost entirely overlooked in much modern writing upon the subject.

No one acquainted with his earlier works will suppose that Dr. Scott is an apostle of conservatism, and no careful reader of this book will think that he has become one. He acknowledges the gains which the newer methods of study have disclosed and he fully accepts such of them as seem to him to be well

* *The Validity of the Gospel Record.* By Ernest F. Scott, D.D. (Nicholson and Watson. Price 8*s.* 6*d.* net. 1938.)

grounded. But his main purpose is to marshall the factors which are overwhelmingly against theories which would assert that, in the main, the Gospel record is the result of the myth-making activities of an early Church which freely modified such historical traditions as it possessed or might have acquired, and created others, as it strove to meet its needs in controversy, evangelism, doctrine, morals and worship. Thus he insists upon the importance of the fact that there was a vital continuity between the written Gospels and the previous traditions, and the inferences which follow from it. There has been much irresponsible play with the difference between oral tradition and written documents, whereas 'the documents are nothing essentially but the tradition put into writing.' There must have been a large continuity from the first if the Gospels and the earlier documents were to win acceptance, as manifestly they did. Again, Dr. Scott insists that nothing in literature exactly corresponds with our Gospels : 'all comparisons break down at some crucial point.' The chief interest of the Gospels is historical, as it was no less of the documents which lay behind them. The data of the Synoptic problem show the care taken to keep close to approved tradition, which was so reverenced that it could not be discarded or falsified. That is why the Gospels are largely compilations; and this reverence and care did not suddenly arise, though it no doubt increased, when the traditions were first put into writing, but, as Dr. Scott shows, would have operated effectively, if with less secure safeguards, while yet the traditions were circulating orally. While making full allowance for the differences between the modern outlook and that of the first century, Dr. Scott regards the Lukan words 'as they delivered them unto us who from the beginning were eye-witnesses and ministers of the word,' as indicating the test which had always been applied. He has also much that is valuable to say upon the point that, in the circumstances of the primitive Church as well as at other times, interpretation of facts does not necessarily affect the facts themselves. 'By the time the Gospels were written the Church had reflected on its message, and had learned to express it in terms which might have appeared strange to Jesus himself' . . . 'the evangelists believed in the message as now proclaimed by the church, and tried to find confirmation

of it in the history. But from this it does not follow that the history was dependent on the message.' Dr. Scott here, as in his last chapter, argues that the nature of the religious message was such that it involved a knowledge of Jesus. He also gives reasons for rejecting the now common idea that the Fourth Gospel only reveals the full development of theological and apologetic tendencies found in all of them, and that in *Mark* we should look for all the characteristics found in *John*.

Two illuminating chapters deal with the effects upon the tradition which resulted from its use in worship and in the life of the Christian society. Dr. Scott protests that the notion of 'communal activity' is 'often employed, even by serious thinkers, to do duty for real investigation into the sources of ideas and movements.' Not less necessary is his complaint that in much recent enquiry 'everything is considered from the side of worship in its purely ceremonial sense,' whereas for early Christians religion was life in its whole extent. Again, he does not think it is reasonably conceivable 'that memories of Jesus were not preserved for their own sake, but only survived because they happened to be used now and then by preachers as illustrations. A theory so absurd on the very face of it ought never to have found its way into serious criticism.' Nor will he allow any very great creative influence to the exercise of spiritual gifts in the primitive Church, for so much in the Gospels is quite alien to the ecstatic mood in which prophets delivered their oracles. On the other hand, the recitation of utterances of Jesus or of episodes in His life during meetings for worship provided a means for the preservation of the tradition, even while it was not yet in writing. For this practice means that the tradition was a common and not a private possession, and frequent public recitation on the whole makes strongly for stability. Deviations would be noticed and challenged; while if the Church had invented sayings relevant to its own problems, they would have been such as bore unmistakeably on particular cases. Dr. Scott puts forward many other considerations which lead him to hold that 'nothing, in fact, could be less justified than the claim that by connecting a Gospel episode with a supposed church problem we put it back into its "living situation"—into the soil out of which it grew.'

Prof. Scott next passes to consider more fully the oral tradition stage of the materials later embodied in written documents, and the meaning of 'Form.' Here again he finds much to support his main theses. 'It would not be too much to say that artificial form, so far from throwing doubt on the things stated, is a mark of accuracy.' The fixed form was a safeguard. 'If it was not observed the listeners would at once recognize that something had been added or left out. The form bound down the narrative to the one accepted version of the facts.' In considering the beginning of the tradition, Dr. Scott of course allows that when we have worked back as far as possible, we are still left with a period in which everything was unstable. He therefore goes on to ask whether there are grounds for believing that, in the attempt to conserve a genuine tradition, early Christians were not too late, and enumerates several checks which operated to preserve the true facts.

A concluding chapter has much that is wise to say about the importance of the issue with which the book is concerned. The writer holds that faith cannot guarantee historical facts but also that the Gospels cannot be studied without some regard to their religious purpose. The significant thing is that their religious value cannot be separated from their historical value. His judgment is that unless the Church faithfully transmitted the facts of the life of Jesus it had neither any very distinctive message nor any right to exist. 'Nothing but a true record could answer the purpose, since the thing that happened was the revelation.'

This notice may give the impression that Dr. Scott's book is a series of rather dogmatic statements. It is nothing of the sort; but the arguments in his two hundred pages are so concise and various that they do not lend themselves to further summary exposition. This is a good book, one of the best on its subject, and it should be studied by everyone about to start on an investigation into the historical reliability of the Gospel records, as it should help the student to distinguish between fact-controlled theory and baseless speculation, and may prevent waste of time. It is clearly and ably written, and there is a useful bibliography.

A PRIESTLY HISTORIAN

By the Rev. J. R. McCallum.

DEAN SWIFT in *Gulliver's Travels* tells us that his hero, in one of the countries which he visits, has an unusual piece of good fortune. The governor of the country has the power to recall the dead, and he invites Gulliver 'to call up whatever person he would choose to name from the beginning of the world until the present time.' Gulliver thereupon has a chat with Aristotle, Alexander the Great, and Julius Caesar. The Church historian can only resort to the persons and events of the early centuries through the medium of documentary evidence and conjecture. The acute investigator, however, attains considerable skill, and among the number of those who probe the past with insight Monsignor Batiffol holds high rank. These studies of early Church History were, some of them, intended by the author for publication, while others have been collected from various periodicals and included under the comprehensive title of *Cathedra Petri*.[1]

Monsignor Batiffol died in 1929. His literary work was largely concerned with the controversy to which the criticism of liberal Protestant writers gave rise in the late nineteenth century. That criticism hit the old fortifications hard. The force of the attack can be gauged by citing the volleys which Harnack and his associates delivered. Peter, for instance, it was asserted, never was in Rome at all. The New Testament says nothing of his being there, and other evidence is meagre. The Roman Church, again, did not exist as an institution before the second century, and only came into existence in antagonism to the institutional form of the faith set on foot by Marcion. The 'primacy' of Rome was no more than a partnership with other episcopal churches. Such were the breaches made in the Catholic defences, and the task of such scholars as Batiffol has been to construct a kind of Maginot line to withstand fresh assaults. There can be little doubt that his research establishes

[1] *Cathedra Petri*. By Pierre Batiffol. Les Editions du Cerf. 1938. 40 *frs*.

historical facts. It rests with the reader to value the erudition brought to bear and to make his own allowances for the bias and bent of the author. In regard to Harnack's plea for Marcion's influence on the primitive Church, we shall be inclined to agree that some institutional form existed before Marcionism.

> 'Certainly the Marcionite churches had an episcopate, a baptism, a eucharist. This fact establishes Marcionism, however, as a Catholicism which had gone off the track. For Catholicism did not borrow from Marcionism such things as baptism, the eucharist, the episcopate. It was the great novelty of Marcion that he repudiated the Old Testament, and set up a New Testament, amended and abridged. . . . But the materials which he used to do this were already in Catholic hands.'

The discussion passed in the early twentieth century to a point gained through the labour of Lightfoot and Gore. These learned prelates upheld the apostolic succession, stipulating, however, that confederation and not the primacy of any single bishop was the essence of the system. Mgr. Batiffol accepts the grounds upon which this result was obtained, but he hesitates at the main conclusion because he insists that conformity of faith could scarcely have come about without some overruling superior discretion.

> 'I may refer to Gore and Lightfoot. They connect the episcopate with the apostles, and I am in complete agreement with them. I only demur when they regard the episcopate established in each church as one of a confederation of equal bishops linked simply by bonds of Christian brotherhood, without any bond of conformity of faith or discipline.'

Among the titles that designate the Roman See, that of *principatus* is of particular interest because it explains and embodies every other title. It implies a primacy and a priority in everything of significance. Mgr. Batiffol finds it in frequent use from about the fifth century.

> 'The first time that the title *principatus* is applied to the Holy See, so far as we know, is by Boniface on 11 March, 422. He writes to the bishops of Thessaly to defend the rights of the Pope over Illyria. The apostolic see has, he says, a right by primacy and priority to receive the complaints of all the bishops. Pope Boniface asserts that this right derives from the honour conferred by the Saviour upon St. Peter.'

The assertion of the *principatus* was absolute, and necessarily so, because even in the early centuries a kind of Gallican movement to exalt a national church against Rome seems to have occurred and been repressed through the instrumentality of this title. The bishops of the province of Arles addressed a request

to Pope Leo in the fifth century in favour of the privileges of the See of Arles. They said that predecessors of Leo had confirmed these privileges, since Arles was held to have a right of primacy in Gaul, as Rome had over the churches of the world. The reply of Leo was that Rome had a primacy over all the churches of the world, which was the *principatus* derived directly from the apostle Peter. Arles might have an 'ecclesiastical supremacy' in Gaul, but this was a very different thing from the absolute superiority with which the title *principatus* endowed the See of Rome. It may be worth noting, even while we catch our breath at the capacity of the Roman Church for such a range of power, that the title *principatus* was used of the Emperor (*e.g.* the Principate of Nero), and is so used by one of the Popes whose letters Batiffol cites: and the transmutation of secular into spiritual power, by the use of similar terms, is one of the most interesting developments in Church History. This tendency, as readers of Bryce's *Holy Roman Empire* well know, was destined to dominate the whole of mediaeval history in Europe.

A prominent place is given to an enquiry into the historical background of papal titles such as *Principatus*, *Sedes apostolica*, *Princeps apostolorum*. Here a taste for the archaeology of ranks and privileges will be agreeably satisfied, for the documentary scrutiny is on a magnificent scale and the historical acumen which the writer displays leads to several ingenious deductions. We may mention the question of the 'Festival of St. Peter's Throne.' The date of this festival was February 22. Mgr. Batiffol gives reasons for its having been an old pagan holiday, and brings to our notice a sermon for that day which urged the congregation not to offer food to the dead — an interesting instance of the survival of pagan customs in a Christian environment. Every student knows that much light has been shed, and will continue to be shed, on early Church History by two great facts, the existence of the Roman Empire with its order, ranks and ceremonial, and the persistence of pagan rites and festivals. Mgr. Batiffol agrees that both these influences were in a measure grafted on to the growing Church, but his leading contention is that the Bishop of Rome possessed rights and powers unrelated to the fact that Rome was the centre of the contemporary world,

and deriving from the trust deed of *Matthew* xvi, 18, 'Thou art Peter.' 'The Roman Church was more than any church because of Peter.' This means that he rejects Harnack's well-known argument for this text being a second-century interpolation in the interests of Roman authority, and traces the Petrine supremacy in the various titles used in subsequent centuries to designate the papacy. In other words, the learned author is not without that curious blend of criticism and credulity which obliges the reader constantly to ask himself whether he is listening to the historian or to the priest. Those who hear the historian will value much that is here set down; and those who listen to the priest will accept all, and be all the more impressed by the somewhat peremptory tone in which they are addressed.

Batiffol was none the less one of those scholars whose zeal and skill in knowledge has gained the respect which everyone pays to learning. This volume contains contributions which he made to various French journals of research as well as to our English *Journal of Theological Studies*. Let us accord him acknowledgment, now that he has gone before us, in yet another journal of religious thought published in that liberty-loving country of which Voltaire said that it was so free as 'to permit every man to go to heaven his own way.'

ST. PAUL AND THE INSTITUTION OF THE EUCHARIST

By the Rev. P. R. Smythe, M.A., B.D.

SCHOLARS are widely agreed that the evidence for the dominical institution of the Eucharist is to be found only in St. Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians and not in the Gospels. St. Luke is the only evangelist who seems to refer to the institution, but the authentic text omits his reference, and the longer and worse attested account has been imported from St. Paul. We are therefore left with the dilemma: are we to believe the Evangelists or St. Paul? Each answers the question according to his eucharistic theology rather than according to any historical criterion.

It is hoped in this note to show that St. Paul and the evangelists do not disagree in their narrative, but only that St. Paul's comment, which he does not claim to be more than an interpretation, differs, and that not extensively. The relevant verses (*I Cor.* xi, 23-6) are thus given in the R.V.:

> 'For I received of the Lord that which I also delivered unto you, how that the Lord Jesus in the night in which he was betrayed took bread; and when he had given thanks, he brake it, and said, This is my body, which is for you: this do in remembrance of me. In like manner also the cup, after supper, saying, This cup is the new covenant in my blood: this do, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me. For as oft as ye eat this bread, and drink the cup, ye proclaim the Lord's death till he come.'

There is one variant reading, but it is not important for the present purpose. The above is a correct version, but it is also possible to render it thus:

> 'For I received from the Lord, what I have also transmitted to you, that the Lord Jesus in the night when he was being betrayed took a loaf and after a blessing broke it, and said, This is my body which is for you; you are doing this in my memory. Similarly (he took) the cup after dinner, saying, This cup is the new covenant in my blood; you are doing this, as often as you drink, in my memory. For as often as you eat this loaf and drink the cup, you proclaim the Lord's death till he come.'

The main alteration is the change of interpretation from the imperative to the indicative. The second person plural in the present indicative and the present imperative in Greek are identical in form, and this ambiguity is recognized in certain New Testament passages. But it does not seem to have occurred to interpreters of this passage to render it in the indicative sense. In preferring the imperative they have clearly been influenced by the imperatives given in the Synoptists, but St. Paul is admittedly earlier, and independent of the Synoptic tradition. Moreover to render in the indicative harmonizes with St. Paul's comment 'you proclaim,' which, so far as form goes, might equally well be a command.

If this interpretation be admitted as linguistically justifiable, what follows? The institution of a rite is eliminated from Jesus' words, and appears as a repetition only in St. Paul's comment. Jesus wishes that the disciples should remember Him by the solemn character of their last meal together. Again, the wine, the blood of the grape, symbolizes the blood Jesus is to shed at the

inauguration of the New Covenant. 'As often as you drink' is doubtful; but it is not absolutely needful to insert 'it,' understood, with the R.V. The reference is probably to the sips taken by the eleven disciples present, in turn. (The absence of Judas Iscariot may be inferred from the imperfect tense, 'He was being betrayed.') Eleven sips are enough to satisfy the sense. Or again, less probably, Jesus may wish that every future drink of wine should remind them of this.

It now remains to discuss St. Paul's comment. This reveals the third aspect of the Last Supper. We have had the commemorative and the contractual; we now get the eschatological,[1] 'till he come.' The eschatological character of the meal is confirmed by St. Mark, though in a different fashion. 'And he said unto them, This is my blood of the covenant, which is shed for many. Verily I say unto you, I will no more drink of the fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new in the kingdom of God' (*Mk.* xiv, 24, 25). On this point Mark is probably right. Jesus expected only a brief interval to elapse between the Last Supper and the Messianic Banquet. Matthew emphasizes this by adding 'with you.' But when St. Paul was writing to the Corinthians some years had passed since the Crucifixion, and the Return, though still ardently expected, was delayed.

Jesus, then, did not expect or enjoin any repetition of the Last Supper, but here we find it assumed by St. Paul as an existing custom. How it arose we are not told, but we may easily imagine. All that we learn is that through the Eucharist the Christians proclaimed the Lord's death, provisionally, till He came. The motives were clearly those of imitation and commemoration. Neither dominical nor ecclesiastical institution is required to explain what arose so easily and spontaneously. It began the more easily as an interim practice designed to fill a brief interval.

[1] The supposed sacrificial aspect is absent, as Buchanan Gray has shown. (*Sacrifice in the Old Testament*, pp. 393 *ff.*).

BOOK REVIEWS

THE CENTURY OF CRISIS*

Cambridge has won the race and completed its history of ancient civilization before the collapse of modern civilization. As the Duke of Wellington said to Mr. Creevey about the Battle of Waterloo, 'It has been a near thing, Sir, a damned near thing.' This is the last volume of the international commentary on history sponsored by the University of Cambridge. Three out of twenty chapters only are written by Cambridge men, but we should add that the two written by Professor Birkett are perhaps the most interesting in the volume. Oxford is represented by Professor Collingwood who writes on Roman Britain; his occupancy of the chair of metaphysical philosophy reminds us that Oxford still cherishes the tradition that joins ancient history and philosophy under the title of humane letters. Germany still contributes its full quota, and the blight which is supposed to have fallen on German culture and religion is not very obvious in these chapters. We miss the engaging eccentricity of Professor Weber who discovered the purity of Commodus. The grim task of unravelling the tangled skein of third century history, with a new Emperor on the average every two years, and not infrequently two or three at the same time, is divided between Scotland and Hungary.

This is the last volume of the ancient history; the mediaeval section is already completed and the modern history brought down to the last war. The spirit of Lord Acton rests from its labours, and his works do follow him.

To begin with a few general criticisms. Uniformity of style, it may be said, is lacking in this new Temple of Clio, which presents a bewildering variety of architecture down to the debased Palladian, the mixture of pedantry and slang which prevails in our modern lecture rooms. Again, it is not quite clear whether these volumes are intended for the general reader or for the student; if for the former, certain parts seem too technical and recondite; if for the latter, there are too few authorities quoted to make them an altogether satisfactory book of reference. Statements are made about highly controversial matters which are not supported by any argument. No doubt a discussion of every disputable point would have swelled the work to an unconscionable length. Sometimes, too, a reader who is dissatisfied with the verdict of one expert can turn to another and find a different point of view. In the multitude of counsellors there is wisdom; but it would be rather dangerous to quote *The Cambridge Ancient History*

* *The Cambridge Ancient History*, Volume xii. *The Imperial Crisis and Recovery*. (Cambridge University Press. 35/- net. 1939.)

as an authority. For example, we are told on page 153 that Aurelian's evacuation of Dacia 'removed Roman civilization as completely as Trajan had driven out the earlier Dacian inhabitants of the land.' This is regarded as deadly heresy in Roumania, where the continuous occupation of the country by their Roman ancestors is an article of faith. The historian of to-day has difficulties that were unknown to his predecessor a century ago. The old-fashioned photographer used to insist that his victim should keep still, but modern research and the spade of the excavator are constantly discovering material which upsets old conclusions; the modern historian must sometimes sigh for the days when writing history was merely a question of interpreting a few texts. Already, we understand, portions of the early part of the compendium are regarded as out of date. But, as Dr. Johnson said in the Preface to his Dictionary,

> 'In this work, when it shall be found that much is omitted, let it not be forgotten that much likewise is performed. It may repress the triumph of malignant criticisms to observe that we have only failed in an attempt which no human powers have hitherto completed.'

The present volume is called 'The Imperial Crisis and Recovery.' Living as we do in a crisis which threatens to become endemic we, or at any rate the younger generation, whose memories go no further back than August, 1914, should be able to breathe the strange atmosphere of the third century A.D., which to the dwellers in the peaceful Victorian Age seemed to invest the figures of the time with a sort of nightmare quality. Yet even now there seems something incredible in the strange procession of ephemeral rulers raised aloft for a moment by a wave of military sedition only to perish in the trough of the next wave. One feels inclined to exclaim, as Macbeth did when the weird sisters showed him the phantoms of kings to come,

> 'What, will the line stretch out to the crack of doom?
> Another yet?—A seventh?—I'll see no more:
> And yet the eighth appears.'

Why should any sane man have wished to be an Emperor in the third century, when a violent death awaited him usually at the end of about two years? And how monstrous were some of the personalities who postured for a time at the head of affairs: the amazing Emperor Elagabalus, the boy-priest of the fetish of Emesa, the devotee of the Syrian goddess Ashtaroth, whom the Phœnicians call Astarte, Queen of Heaven; twelve years later, in glaring contrast to the effeminate debauchee and devotee, the gigantic Maximinus who, as is gravely reported, wore his wife's bracelet for a ring, smashed horses' teeth with his fist or their legs with his heel, and consumed a keg of wine and sixty pounds of meat a day. Possibly these eccentric persons affected the public as film stars do to-day. Much of this wild gossip, no doubt, is due to the sensational memoir writers. Suetonius was their natural model,

> 'and for their uncritical information, plain and spicy, rumoured and true, in the manner of modern journalists— mytho-historical volumes is the apt designation' (p. 599).

It is not very easy to believe in some of the Emperors, but then it is not very easy to believe in certain modern dictators, whether we look at the crudely idealised portraits painted by their idolaters or at the hideous caricatures of hostile propaganda. Some future generation may know what the real Hitler and Stalin were like; more probably they will always remain rather shadowy figures. Mr. Miller, of Glasgow University, Professor Ensslin, of Erlangen, and Professor Alföldi, of Budapest, have done their best with the intractable material. The last named has evoked a shadowy likeness of Gallienus, the patron of Plotinus, a gentleman, a scholar and a dilettante, who struggled valiantly but on the whole ineffectually against the chaos which enveloped him. The volume of plates shows us an illuminating statue of Diocletian. He looks a little bit like Mr. Gladstone and not at all like the stage tyrant over whose demise Lactantius gloats in *De Mortibus Persecutorum*. As a matter of fact, the poor fellow seems to have done his best to avoid collision with Christianity, to which his wife and daughter are said to have been secretly addicted. It was not until just before his abdication that Galerius, with the aid of a fire in the imperial palace, which may or may not have been stage-managed, stampeded him into the persecuting edict that inaugurated the final conflict between the Empire and the Church.

As Christians we are naturally interested rather in the emergent forces of the age to come, in the growth of Christianity, than in the fading outline of that which was ready to vanish away. Fortunately the story which Dr. Streeter has told in the former volume is taken up by Professor Birkett in this.

> 'Two chapters (XIII and XIV) were written by the late Professor Birkett shortly before his death in 1935. He did not live to revise them or to consider their contents in relation to other parts of the volume which were then not written. These chapters needed to receive some revision and addition, and for this the volume is indebted to Professor Creed. An indication of these additions is given in the Table of Contents, but it is in place to say here that the account of Marcion, the gnostics, Syriac Christianity and the teachings of Mani are almost entirely as Professor Birkett wrote them. The two chapters will be welcomed as a last example of the author's scholarship and intuition' (Introduction).

Over and over again as we read the chapters we are reminded of the admirably learned and entertaining papers he used to read at our conferences and of the incisive impromtus with which he was wont to supplement his own or other men's labours. Here is his description of the voluminous productions of Ephraem Syrus:

> 'Much of it is poetry, *i.e.* works written in lines of so many

> syllables. Syriac poetry is even easier to write than blank verse in English, for only the number of syllables need be counted; there is no accent, no quantity, no rhyme. And as Ephraem is extraordinarily prolix, and as when the thought is unravelled it is mostly commonplace, his poems make very heavy reading for us moderns' (p. 502).

He might perhaps have said for us elderly people, for the criticism seems rather applicable to some of our younger poets.

At any rate Ephraem throws some light on the very obscure and important question of the origin and history of Manichaeism, one of the three world religions (Christianity and neo-Platonism are the other two) which strove for the suffrages of mankind in the *débâcle* of paganism. Professor Birkett always maintained in opposition to Harnack, with whose article in the ninth edition of the Encyclopaedia Britannica it is interesting to compare these chapters, that Mani was a Christian, though a very heretical one. This view has been proved to be correct by the recent discovery by Sir Aurel Stein and others of Manichaean documents in Central Asia.

> 'Unfortunately they are all fragments, bits of torn books and rolls, but they are at least the writings of Manichees, not mere refutations. . . . As recently as 1931 the yet more surprising discovery of a small Manichaean library has been made in Egypt consisting of about half a dozen volumes in Coptic, containing hymns, letters, some historical accounts of the tragic death of Mani, and his successor Sisinnius, and a lengthy work called the Chapters or First Principles' (p. 505).

> 'The rôle of Jesus in Manichaeism deserves a paragraph. Before the discoveries at Turfan the general tendency had been to emphasize the oriental element in Mani's system and to regard the Christian element, then known most from Augustine, as due mainly to the adoption of a Christian dress by Manichaeism in the West. The new discoveries have changed all that: they prove that the Christian element, though heretical, is fundamental to Manichaeism, and that Mani, who came from the land of Babylon and had travelled to India, drew most of his inspiration from the Christianity of Marcion and of Bardaisan' (p. 509).

The elect, who were the true Manichees, pushed their determination not to produce fresh life or to take it to extravagant lengths; not content with being celibates, communists, vegetarians and teetotallers, they would not even cook or cut into a loaf of bread. On receiving a slice from the hand of a disciple they thus addressed it: 'I neither reaped nor winnowed nor ground thee, nor set thee in an oven; it was another did this and brought to me: I eat thee innocently.' 'Yet a sacramental, even physical, benefit accrued to the Universe from his eating it. This came to pass through the particles of light contained in the food passing into his own pure body, which at his death would be conveyed somehow into the realms of light' (p. 511). It was one of the first duties of the laity, the mere Hearers, to provide food for the elect. There is a delightful picture in the volume of

plates of Manichaean priests looking remarkably like Anglican dignitaries in dog collars and surplices sitting in what appear to be prebendal stalls. It comes from Chinese Turkestan.

Very interesting are Professor Birkett's sketches of the erratic Modernist, Marcion, who threw the Old Testament overboard because he could not believe that the Jehovah who ordered the extermination of the Canaanites and enjoined the elaborate taboos of *Leviticus* could be the same as the God of love, the Father of Our Lord Jesus Christ; and of the Montanists, who fought a despairing rearguard action on behalf of the old prophetic Christianity of the first century. They held the old view that the heavenly Jerusalem was shortly to descend upon the earth. It was to appear at the little town of Pepuza, the sort of Keswick of the movement. Most of the Montanists were Phrygians. They had the extraordinary luck to capture the first great Christian writer of the West, him whom but for them we should probably call St. Tertullian. *Medio tutissimus ibis,* however, has been in all ages the maxim of the Christian hierarchy. The Montanists were frozen out of the Church; they were driven out of Rome by the Bishop at the instigation, it is alleged, of Praxeas the Patripassian, whom Tertullian damned in one of his tremendous epigrams, '*paracletum fugavit et patrem crucifixit.*' 'After me,' said Maximilla, his coadjutrix, 'there shall be no prophetess more; then will be the end.' She was wrong; the Lord delayed His coming, and there have been many prophets and prophetesses since. Millenarianism was still enough alive in the sixteenth century to be condemned by one of Cranmer's Articles, which unkindly refers to those who go about to revive a fable of Jewish dotage. It still flourishes rankly in the Protestant undergrowth and is forced into new luxuriance whenever there is a crisis. And, fantastic as his theories may seem, the tolerant humanitarianism of Marcion, who found his ideal in the Jesus of St. Luke and the teaching of St. Paul, is never likely to become obsolete. It appeals to the spirit of our age because it belongs to the Spirit of all ages.

Needless to say, by the third century the old joyous natural paganism of the earlier ages of antiquity had long since passed away; gloomy rites like the blood baptism of the *Taurobolium* were spreading even among the cultivated classes; astrology then as now had many votaries; spiritualism had its counterpart, and there was much crass superstition among the vulgar.

Professor Bidez of Ghent tells the story of the last phase of Hellenic thought, neo-Platonism. It is a story of rapid decline. That phase began with Plotinus, of whom Professor Bidez says, 'He still fascinates us to-day. It is impossible to come into contact with him without being overpowered.' Then came Porphyry, at the same time the populariser of the teaching of Plotinus and the adversary of the Church. There were two

Christian doctrines the neo-Platonists could never stomach, the Incarnation and the Resurrection of the Body. That was why even the theology of an Origen seemed barbarous to them. Iamblichus, the last of the trio, was ready to hold out a hand to any enemy of the Church and to mobilise in favour of the old religion the adherents of every heathen cult. 'Whoever has tried to read this writer will ask himself how such a nincompoop could have been regarded by the most distinguished men of his time as a divine master' (p. 636). We are not among those who have read Iamblichus, but we do venture to express a doubt whether the man whom the noble Julian idolized could have been quite so silly.

Professor Baynes, of London University, writes on the great persecution, the final struggle between the bureaucratic empire of Diocletian and the new faith. And here we must express our pleasure that all the writers of this volume, whatever may be their precise theological standpoint, adopt what we may call a friendly attitude towards Christianity. Gibbon, on the other hand, and other writers of his period obviously believe, in whatever decorous phrases they may veil their opinions, that the transition from the enlightened paganism of ancient Greece and Rome to Christianity was a step backwards. Such, too, was the opinion of the late Professor Bury. It does not seem to be the view of any writer in the present volume. Professor Baynes is quite frankly and unreservedly on the side of the martyrs. More than once in the chapters which he contributes he stresses the fact that the views which he puts forward are his own and not necessarily those of the compilers of the History. For example, he gives it as his opinion that at some time before Trajan's reign there had been a direct imperial pronouncement proscribing the sect.

> 'By the time of Trajan it had become established that the persistent avowal of Christianity carried as its consequence the penalty of death. From that position, in the view of the present writer, the Roman state never receded until A.D. 311—until that year the Christian Church was never granted express recognition as a lawful corporation' (p. 665).

Alföldi thinks otherwise (p. 207). Who shall decide where such Doctors disagree?

GAMALIEL MILNER.

THE PROBLEMS OF THE LORD'S PRAYER*

Although the Lord's Prayer is so short and seems so simple, there are many problems connected with it. The problems are about it rather than in it. What is its real origin? Did Jesus Himself compose it? What was its earliest form? These questions are harder to answer than those that may be asked about the precise meaning of certain petitions and phrases in the Prayer itself.

* *The Eternal Prayer.* By the Rev. Walter W. Joyce. (Skeffington. 2/6. 1939.)

In 1891, Dr. Chase, later Bishop of Ely, contributed a scholarly essay to *Cambridge Texts and Studies* entitled *The Lord's Prayer in the Early Church,* in which a mass of information may be found; but it is a treatise practically unknown to parochial clergy. In 1897, another great Cambridge scholar, Dr. Charles Taylor, Master of St. John's College, brought out his *Sayings of the Jewish Fathers,* which contains a valuable Excursus on The Lord's Prayer and its Old Testament and Rabbinical parallels. This also will be consulted by New Testament scholars.

The Rev. W. W. Joyce, in his little volume, *The Eternal Prayer,** writes not for scholars but for plain men and women. The treatment of his theme is wider and more original than is usual in the parochial pulpit. He not only notes and compares the two versions of the Lord's Prayer, which we have in Mt. VI, 9-13; and in Lk. XI, 2-4; but he discusses the difficult questions of their source, and ultimate origin. He is not inclined to think that both are derived from Q (a designation given to a Gospel Source, used by both Mt. and Lk.). In this he has the support of Dr. Streeter, who held that the Lord's Prayer in the First and Third Gospels is derived from M and L respectively (*i.e.* sources peculiar to each of these Gospels).

Although the Gospels of Matthew and Luke are much later than Q and Mark, of which they make large use, it does not follow that the special sources M and L are also later than Q and Mark. Some portions of M and L are certainly later, but other portions are probably not: *e.g.* in M, Pilate washing his hands, the sealing of the tomb, and the triune baptismal formula are late; but the condemnation of hypocrisy in prayer, almsgiving, and fasting are early. So in L the Parables of the Prodigal Son and the Good Samaritan and three words from the Cross are early, whereas the walk to Emmaus is late. Those M and L portions which contain the Lord's Prayer may well be early.

Why does the Prayer in M differ from the Prayer in L, if both go back to the original utterance of Jesus? Jesus spoke in Aramaic, and M and L give us independent Greek translations. This will account for some differences, although only minor ones. Again Matthew's Gospel is a Jewish Christian Gospel circulating in Jewish Christian Churches, and so no doubt its Prayer will be the same as that used in the public worship of those Churches. Luke's Gospel circulated in Gentile Christian Churches, and so possibly reproduces the form of the Prayer used in them. A shorter form usually has higher claims to priority and genuineness than a longer one, expansion being more common than contraction. Hence M's Prayer may well be an expansion of an original L form in imitation of Jewish Synagogue Prayers.

This influence of Synagogue forms is seen in the addition of the Doxology, which is Jewish, and which textual criticism proves to have been no part of the original Prayer. It is also seen in the opening of the Prayer.

Jesus seems always to have addressed God as 'Abba' (*i.e.* the Aramaic for Father), which we have in L. The Jewish Rabbis spoke of 'Our Father in Heaven,' and this we have in M. It is of great interest to note that for liturgical use M's Prayer replaced L's at an early date, and became universal. The *Didache* and *Apostolic Constitutions,* which are the earliest pieces of Christian literature after the New Testament to contain the Lord's Prayer, both give it in the form (with very slight differences) in which we have it in St. Matthew's Gospel.

In as much as every phrase and petition in the Lord's Prayer has parallels either in the Old Testament, Apocrypha, or Rabbinical Literature, Mr. Joyce seems inclined to conclude that it was composed prior to the ministry of Jesus, was used in Jewish homes and Synagogues, and that Jesus as a child learnt it. There is no conclusive proof for this hypothesis. Some will naturally ask, 'If the Prayer is Jewish in origin, why is it not preserved amongst the many Jewish prayers which have come down to us?' To this some reply that when the Christians began to use it, the Jews ceased to use it, and therefore it has no place in Jewish liturgies.

But this is mere hypothesis. Two things seem to be clear about the Prayer: (1) It is the quintessence of the Jewish religion, especially as set forth in the teaching of their prophets and wise men. (2) It is the quintessence of The Gospel of Jesus as preserved for us by the synoptists. Some may question the first conclusion and say 'Surely the Prayer passes beyond Judaism. For instance, did Judaism teach that the divine forgiveness is dependant upon the exercise of human forgiveness? Was not Jesus original in teaching this?' Jesus the son of Sirach taught this before Jesus The Christ taught it:

> 'Forgive thy neighbour the hurt that he hath done thee;
> And then thy sins shall be pardoned when thou prayest.'
> Ecclus XXVIII, 2.

Some may question the second conclusion and say, 'Surely The Lord's Prayer presents us not with the essential Gospel, but only with an imperfect Gospel.' Some Christians have felt this so strongly that they have refused to use the Lord's Prayer. The answer to this second objection can be found in Mr. Joyce's book. Its readers will realize how profound, how comprehensive, and how essentially Christian the Lord's Prayer is, not only in its petitions, but in the ideas and ideals which constitute its inspiration and action.

We have only space to touch on one further problem. The Prayer according to St. Luke was given in answer to the request of the Apostles, 'Lord, teach us to pray.' Yet in the only Apostolic prayer which St. Luke records in Acts (IV, 24-30), the Apostles address God not as 'Father,' but as Master (*despota*), speaking to Him not as sons but as slaves (*douloi*). Did Jesus teach them in vain how to pray? Or is there some other solution of this problem?

Mr. Joyce's volume, written in a spirit of open-minded investigation and Pastoral responsibility, is a model of what such books should be, and we desire for it a wide circulation. Nothing is more needful to-day than to popularize sound learning in the cause of religious education, and to this great work Mr. Joyce has made a worthy contribution. H.D.A.M.

ST. PAUL THROUGH MODERN EYES*

Canon Wilfred Knox in his book 'St. Paul and the Church of the Gentiles' aims at helping us to think through the mind of a man of the Hellenistic Age and to see how he thought and what his thought-forms really meant in their own proper context. His scholarly work shows a deep understanding of the religious tendencies of the age and a clear unbiassed judgment. Very often it throws most interesting light on the meaning of words and phrases in the Pauline Epistles.

Believing that the central point of all Paul's thought was his conversion and experience of deliverance in knowledge of Christ, Canon Knox tries to show how Paul's theology developed as he came into contact with various forms of Gentile thought and strove to express in each case the centrality of Jesus in human life. Paul was prepared to adopt the thought — or language — forms of any intellectual system he found prevailing in order to convey to his readers the significance of Jesus and His Gospel of Love.

Mr. Knox says in his preface with reference to Philo that

> 'the passionate desire of the Hellenistic man, in so far as he cared for these things, was to find a philosophic basis which would justify him in continuing to practise the form of religion which attracted him or which he had inherited.'

St. Paul's concern was to find and give to the Hellenistic man an exposition of the historical Jesus in current philosophic terms which would enable him to feel justified in adopting the Christian message of the centrality and significance of Jesus and in practising the Christian religion. There is often similarity in words and thought between St. Paul and the Hellenistic writers because, as Mr. Knox says in an appendix on 'The Descent of the Redeemer':

> 'Naturally Paul tends to approach the language of mythological attempts to fit the divine element in the cosmos into figures of contemporary religion, since he is concerned to expound the historical figure of Jesus in terms of the earlier tradition by which Alexandrine Judaism had attempted to read that divine element, as the Wisdom of God, into the cosmogony of Genesis' (p. 225).

Mr. Knox pictures the development of Paul's theology as dating especially from the occasion at Athens (*Acts* xvii) when he found his exposition of the historical Jesus in terms of eschatology and the Last Judgment ridiculed by Epicureans and Stoics, who believed either that the end of the

* *St. Paul and the Church of the Gentiles.* By W. L. Knox. (Cambridge University Press. 15/-. 1939.)

world might come by chance at any time by the natural disintegration of its atoms or that there were cycles or world-ages at the end of which all things would return to primitive fire before they began anew exactly as they had begun before. If the apocalyptic outlook was discredited and it was necessary to turn from the End to the Beginning of things, Paul could easily find already developed in the Synagogues among the Gentiles a form of propaganda to maintain the superiority of Judaism. They had taken the accepted systems, myths and concepts of Gentile philosophy and religion and had striven to show that there was nothing in them which was not already in Judaism. Moses and the *Torah* anticipated them all.

This involved allegorising and expounding the Old Testament in the thought-forms and language of the prevailing science, philosophy and religion of the day, the astrology and eclectic Stoicism, of which Posidonius was probably the greatest exponent, and the mysteries. In this connexion the Wisdom-Theology had been found most useful because Wisdom was capable of identification in various ways with the Stoic Divine Reason and Law pervading the Universe, with the Isis of the popular mystery cult, with the Platonic pre-existent Divine Pattern of the Universe, and with the specifically Jewish *Torah* of which the Ideal Pattern was also thought to have existed eternally.

To prove the superiority of Christianity St. Paul showed that Jesus in the experience of those converted to His religion could deliver men from the fatalism induced by Astrology and Stoicism, and from their spiritual slavery under the Jewish Law. That meant that Jesus was equivalent to that Wisdom which was with God before the creation of the universe, and that He logically assumed a cosmic significance above the planets next to God or with God. From this point Paul's theology naturally develops. Redemption, eternal life, cosmology and gospel-ethics all fall into their place in a quasi-philosophical system, but Mr. Knox regards the Colossian controversy as producing the culmination of Paul's theology; he regards Ephesians as merely a Paulinist introduction to that theology.

As a result of that controversy, 'Paul had to present Christianity in the light of a supreme cosmic relation, without sacrificing its essential insistence on love as the one thing needed' (p. 167) and

> 'the effect . . . whether Paul realised it or not, was to substitute philosophy for homiletic as the basis of Christian preaching. The divine Wisdom, the pattern and agent of creation and the divine Mind permeating the cosmos was identified with Jesus not as a matter of midrashic exposition which could be used and thrown aside, but as an eternal truth in the realm of metaphysics; for only so could the supremacy of Jesus be asserted as against such potent beings as the rulers of the stars in their courses. It is probable that Paul was entirely unaware that his letter would produce this effect: whether he realised it or not, he had committed the Church to the theology of Nicaea' (p. 178).

Several questions are suggested by this investigation of the origins of

Hellenistic Judaism and Pauline Theology. Could Wisdom for the Hellenistic Jews take the place of *Isis,* for instance, without bringing with her into Judaism any of the mystery-cult associated with *Isis?* Mr. Knox apparently thinks it could and rejects outright in his preface the thesis put forward by Prof. E. R. Goodenough in 'By Light, Light,' which seems to see in such similarities as Philo's *Sophia* and the Hellenistic *Isis* an attempt by the Hellenistic Jews to achieve under the figure of *Sophia* in their own religion the mystic experience and salvation of the *Isis*-cult. Professor Goodenough believes that both *Sophia* and *Isis* were mere types to clothe abstract metaphysical principles and that the Hellenistic man kept 'typology subordinate to metaphysics,' whereas 'it was for Christian theologians two centuries or more later to subordinate metaphysics to typology.' Whatever be the truth of that matter, Paul, on Mr. Knox's view, does not subordinate metaphysics to typology because Jesus to him is not a type but a fact of which metaphysics must in future take account as it must take account of all existing facts and their implications. The interesting question to us is whether the explanation of the fact which Pauline or Hellenistic metaphysics gave, based as it was especially on the astrological beliefs of the day and on the limited scientific knowledge, which believed, for instance, in identical world-ages rather than in evolution, and, expressed in language adapted to these beliefs, is adequate and often really intelligible to-day. Mr. Knox unfortunately puts such questions outside the scope of his book, though it cannot fail to raise them acutely. His book, if we understand it rightly, would seem to suggest that it was the question of authority which drove St. Paul ultimately into his metaphysical theory. Apology for his own and his Master's ministry compelled him to claim in the only categories understood at the time a fount of authority for the Gospel behind the *Torah,* above the Planets, and therefore before Creation, out of Time and in Eternity, yet distinct from God. Would not modern metaphysics, following the Synoptic tradition, explain in terms of personality the self-authenticating Divinity of the Ideal Life of Him Who in history 'spoke with authority and not as the scribes'?

W. Richardson.

EDUCATIONAL THEORY AND THE TEACHER'S ART*

It is so easy to be an expert on education. Education is, after all, a thing from which we have all suffered, like measles or chicken-pox. We are therefore all competent to diagnose and cure the effects of a bad education and to prescribe a good one, just as once we have had measles we are competent to cure another sufferer, and the doctor who has been having

* *A Plea for a Plan.* By the Very Rev. C. Alington, D.D. (Longmans, Green & Co. 5/-. 1938.)
Problems in Modern Education. Edited by E. D. Laborde, Ph.D. (Cambridge University Press. 8/6. 1939.)

seven years' hospital training to gain the same end has just wasted his time . . . .

The logic seems faulty somewhere. But it is an undisputed fact (*a*) that education is the easiest subject over which to theorize, and (*b*) that very few of those who are experts in theory have tried or are willing to try to put their theories into practice.

'A Plea for a Plan' by the Very Rev. Dr. Alington, sometime Headmaster of Eton, and 'Problems in Modern Education,' edited by Dr. Laborde, have, however, the advantage of drawing upon large stores of practical experience, and it is to be hoped that they will be read with this in view. Few will dispute Dr. Alington's major conclusion, and the only point open to doubt is the best way of carrying out his proposals, and to cut a way through the tangle of mediaevalism, obscurantism, and vested interest that at present blocks the road. His 'Plea for a Plan' amounts just to this: that seventy per cent. of boys can be said to have either a literary or a scientific bent (he assumes that girls are made in much the same way, but confesses to lack of experience); that some portion of the other thirty per cent. are equally good at both sorts of subject, and in that case their education looks after itself, and they do not need teaching; that those who remain outside these categories are not educable at all, and so also need not be bothered about, except by those who have the care of the feeble-minded; that the two classes into which he divides the majority are each wasting too much time at the others' subjects; and, in short, that the literary class does too much Algebra and the scientific too much Latin Prose.

That highly important document, the Spens Report, has recently been dealing, among other things, with the amount of time wasted on the compulsory study of unsuitable subjects. Dr. Alington comes along with a timely reinforcement of that report. The theory that the educated man ought to know a little bit about everything and everything about something depends on an obsolete and discredited faculty psychology. The old-fashioned purely classical education, concentrating as it did upon one group of allied subjects, has in fact a great deal more to be said for it than some of its detractors imagined, and was probably a better training for at least half the boys who went through it than the smattering of different subjects which they get from the present School Certificate syllabus — and some would put the proportion even higher. So thoroughly has that examination got its octopus-like tentacles round secondary education that the subjects taught in school nowadays depend almost entirely on its syllabus. The older classical course gave, at any rate, an insight into a civilization which is still of supreme importance; which did not make some of the mistakes of our own civilization; and in which a much larger proportion of the influential people put first things first, the things of the spirit above the things of the body. Then, after the series of historical

accidents which determined the present curriculum, came the crowning blunder of the educationists, that of hurling Greek to the wolves who were howling at the doors of their schools; and they did it in the hope that one of their two beloved children might be saved; and they chose Latin. Now, perhaps, they are beginning to realize with some chagrin that they have saved the wrong child, and the wolves are going to get both; and it may be the best way out of our difficulties.

If we had kept Greek instead of Latin, we should have kept the means of studying a culture to which the world owes nearly everything, instead of merely the means of studying a military civilization. We should not have had to waste so much time in the cultivation of Latin Prose, in the vain hope that it would improve our English style. Greek is much the easier language, in spite of the slight initial difficulty with the alphabet. The pupil passes the early difficulties much sooner, and can get on to reading the highly interesting work of the people themselves at a much earlier stage than when he studies Latin. It is true that our own language does not depend so much upon Greek as upon Latin, but scientists should be the first to appreciate a knowledge of the language from which the greater part of their technical terminology is derived.

The author has some very sensible remarks to make on subjects as varied as the teaching of Divinity and of Music; the difference between learning a subject although you dislike it, and because you dislike it (while the former is frequently valuable, the latter can have no value at all) and about the crowded state of the modern time-table — pouring a quart into a pint pot was never an easy task, but it is child's play compared with the job of a modern headmaster when he tries to satisfy all his specialists. Perhaps Dr. Alington is a little hard on the preparatory schools. He has a hit at them in passing for teaching their boys to act Shakespeare instead of drilling the elementary rules into them — by which I rather believe he really means the Latin gender rhymes — and he suggests that the best place for a little elementary science is in the preparatory school curriculum. This is only pushing his own problem, that of deflating an overswollen time-table, one stage further back; the preparatory school headmaster is in fact suffering from just the same difficulty.

Dr. Alington does not state the following proposition in so many words, but I believe he would agree to it; that ultimately the subjects learned matter little, in comparison with the importance of the people teaching them. What really affects one in after years, and what one remembers most of all, is how old So-and-so taught one Latin, not the Latin that he taught; what an efficient beast Such-and-such was, who taught one Algebra, and how good he was at spotting little mistakes and little pieces of slipshod writing or thinking, until you simply could not make those mistakes again. But it was not the Algebra which taught you not to be careless.

There are two misprints, both on p. 65, bottom line (a note which looks as if it were an afterthought); 'tubes' should be read instead of 'cubes,' and Mr. Chips is so spelt, not Chipps.

The book edited by Dr. Laborde consists of the papers read to the Conference of Young Public School Masters held at Harrow in January, 1938; an introductory address by the Headmaster of Bryanston, and four addresses on Christianity in Education, by Sir Cyril Norwood, Dr. W. R. Inge, Professor J. Macmurray and Dr. J. W. Parkes; these are followed in a second part by eight papers by various educational authorities on subjects of more special application; and there is appended an address on Broadcasting and Education by an official of the B.B.C.

Probably the first part of the book will be of most interest to readers of this magazine. There is nothing that is very new in it, but much which deserves continual reconsideration; the necessity of a religious background to education; the need to awaken in the young the same enthusiasm and readiness for service as the dictators succeed in doing; the impossibility of leaving spiritual values out of education, and the difference between a real religious education and a secular cramming to pass examinations; the difficulty of teaching religion, because religion is not a separate subject, like Latin or Mathematics, but a way of life; and a plea (from Dr. Parkes) for a closer synthesis between Christianity and Judaism, and a closer connection between our teaching of the Old and New Testaments.

The papers in Part II (they are mainly on matters of organisation and curriculum rather than on first principles, which is the function of Part I) contain many interesting points of detail. F. R. G. Duckworth has another hit, in the style of Dr. Alington, at the theory that Latin Prose develops lucidity and precision in other subjects. Professor Schwarz, of the University of Vienna, writes most valuably of the psychological basis upon which all our teaching ought to rest; what it is fair and proper to expect of the young at different ages, and what cannot be expected. He gives an excellent concise analysis of the growth of ideas of duty and morality in the child. Professor F. Clarke writes on 'The Crisis of Freedom in Education,' and Dr. Graham Howe on 'Education and Vitality.' The latter, although a good psychologist, admits a tendency in present-day methods to make things too easy.

Herr Sauerwein, of the Montana Institute, Zugerberg, Switzerland, tells of a practical experiment in international education, conceived as the complement of national education, and not as opposed to it. His school has a number of boys from different nations, pursuing their own national systems of education — the English boys even sit for the much-abused School Certificate—but growing up in friendliness and a common life with boys of other nations, learning their points of view and their languages.

The Headmaster of Cheltenham College Junior School writes of 'Curriculum Reform' and quotes Dr. Alington with approval; he is convinced,

like so many of us, of the folly of teaching the very young two foreign languages. Mr. Murray, Director of Physical Education at Mill Hill School, writes on his own subject, and the sort of people who ought to be in charge of it; and Mr. S. H. Wood sums up with some tests of true education.

The whole book provides much food for thought. It is beautifully produced and printed, in the best style of Cambridge University Press books. There is one misprint, on p. 89; 'well-know' should obviously be 'well-known.'

W. H. Oldaker.

HISTORY AND THE GOSPEL*

This book, like everything that Professor Dodd writes, is both interesting and suggestive; whether it will carry conviction is another matter; that will depend largely upon our attitude towards the statement of the writer's position given on p. 13:

> 'To return to a theology of transcendence makes a difference. The Bible, and the New Testament in particular, is not any longer to be treated as an historical corpus, revealing tendencies within history in which the immanent working of the divine is to be recognized. It is the Word of the transcendent God.'

Christianity, he claims, is a historic religion as distinguished from religions whose origin is prehistoric, or religions based upon the teachings of a sage, or religions based upon a myth; and by a historic religion he means one which

> 'depends upon a valuation of historical events as the medium of God's self-revelation in action.'

This necessarily involves a discussion of what is meant by history and the definition at which Dr. Dodd arrives is that it consists of 'events which are of the nature of occurrence *plus* meaning.' In the Gospels the meaning is eschatological, so that in them we find

> 'the mighty act of the transcendent God which brings history to its fulfilment.'

In the central tradition in the New Testament he finds two elements: *Kērygma* or proclamation which consisted of facts about the life, death and resurrection of Christ; the nature of this can be seen in the speeches in Acts as well as in the Pauline epistles and *Hebrews*; and *Didache* or teaching which consists of ethical precepts. The Gospels, he holds, resulted

> 'from the gathering together of material of various kinds about a central strand of testimony embodied from the first in the preaching (*Kērygma*) and teaching (*Didache*) of the Church.'

In the chapter on the historical criticism of the Gospels he shows that there is good reason to suppose that a narrative of the passion was the earliest

* *History and the Gospel.* By C. H. Dodd. (Nisbet and Co., Ltd. 5/-. 1938.)

form of written Gospel, and in a judicious evaluation of Form Criticism shows that it helps

> 'us to study our material in fresh groupings which point to distinct strains of tradition preserved from various motives.'

But he urges that it was the tradition which made the Church, not the Church the tradition.

Jesus, indeed, recognized himself as the Messiah and confined his personal work to the lost sheep of the people of Israel, but

> 'the call of God must go to all men: the judgment of God alone selects those worthy of His Kingdom.'

The Kingdom has come and the ethical teaching of Jesus is the absolute ethic of the Kingdom. Those who accept the revelation made by Jesus became the true Israel of God.

The result of the ministry, death and resurrection of Christ is the emergence of the Church, which fulfils the eschatological hopes of the Old Testament. The preaching of the Gospel and the celebrating of the Sacrament are central in the Church's work, and

> 'their divine intervention which is mediated by every preaching of the Gospel, is the same that was accomplished in the death and resurrection of Christ.'

In the Lord's Supper, he says,

> 'Christ is set before us, incarnate, crucified and risen, and we partake of the benefits of His finished work as contemporaries with it.'

He draws a distinction between secular and sacred history, the former

> 'extends over all recorded time and is still unfinished. In this series events are linked together by succession in time, and by the operation of efficient causes.'

The latter is history 'as a process of redemption and revelation,' not bound to history as a simple succession in time, so that by virtue of sacramental experience

> 'our work-a-day life is made part of the redemptive history set forth in the Gospels.'

I have endeavoured to give, I hope fairly, some of what seem to me the salient points in this interesting book. I will now set down a few criticisms. First, the cogency of much of Professor Dodd's argument depends upon our accepting a theology of transcendence, which many of us are not prepared to accept. Secondly, he does not seem to me to attach sufficient weight to the indisputable fact that during the apostolic period the imminence of the *parousia* was a very important factor in Christian belief. In view of what St. Paul wrote in *I Corinthians* xv, 23-28 I find it impossible to think that he would have interpreted events in the same way as Professor Dodd does. Thirdly, I am inclined to question the adequacy of his view of history, which if I understand him rightly is that history consists of facts plus interpretations. It is no doubt true that every

historian gives an interpretation of the facts which he records, but it is equally true, as Professor Dodd himself points out, that different historians give different interpretations, so that history resides not in the interpretation but in the authenticated facts. Fourthly, I should emphatically deny what appears to be his major premise, that the Bible is 'the word of the transcendent God.' A record of God's revelation, yes; but the word of God is not the Bible but the Incarnate Son, Our Lord Jesus Christ.

E. R. Buckley.

GOD IN CREATION*

The problem of God, transcendent or immanent, or both, has long exercised the minds of men; and their continual swaying to the one side or the other seems to indicate that the principles by which the problem should be solved are not known, or at least not generally accepted. Mr. Dewick has given us, in a book of 300 pages, a mass of information about the subject, including a very valuable summary of the teachings of Hinduism at different stages of its history, and a survey of Christian thought from gospel times to the present day. The historical survey seems indeed to lead up to the present day as a climax, in which we hear on the one side the strident tones of Barthian theology proclaiming its 'new discovery' of God as wholly other, and on the other side the voice of India scarcely modulated through centuries from its age-long theme of pantheism. The reader who has followed all the earlier pages of the book, and seen how much thought has been put into the problem by great human minds, is the more amazed that in the twentieth century it should still be possible for men to hold such divergent views. The author himself recommends a middle course, somewhere between the two extremes, and then, as if pressed by his friends to be more explicit, he says (page 259) the Christian

> 'will be wise if he lays his central emphasis on the personal and moral qualities of God, as Father, Saviour, Friend, and (above all) as Love, rather than on the more abstract conception of God as the All-pervading or the All-inclusive.'

That is true, but we should like to have seen the statement made more strongly as the only course for a Christian. How can we for a moment admit that God is all-pervading, all-inclusive, unless we are prepared to answer in the affirmative St. Thomas's question (quoted on page 156) 'Is God in daemons?' There is a text in Isaiah lvii.15 quoted by the author without its full implications and importance being realised: 'For thus saith the high and lofty One that inhabiteth eternity, whose name is Holy: I dwell in the high and holy place, with him also that is of a contrite and humble spirit.' This Old Testament prophet has laid down once for all the true principles on which the apparent conflict between transcendent and immanent is to be solved. God is the utterly transcendent, in holiness as

* *The Indwelling God.* By E. C. Dewick. (Oxford University Press. 10/6. 1938.)

well as in majesty; but where He finds a humble heart He enters, and that humble heart becomes a high and holy place. It does not say He waits to find a holy heart, for there are none, but a humble, that is a receptive, heart that can become holy. In this one sentence is ruled out the whole realm of ideas of God as immanent in inanimate nature which is incapable of holiness. The reviewer can never forget his feeling of hopelessness in talking to a Radhakrishnan sadhu who asserted that God dwelt as truly in the wooden table as in a person. If instead of using the word 'indwelling' we asked whether God had any moral relationship with a table, there could be no difference of opinion among those who believed in a moral God. India is very proud of its famous '*tat tvam asi*' which proclaims (to put it in Western language) the unity of God and man. But one cannot help feeling that India has not yet reaped the fruit of that great saying, and will not until it is seen as our goal rather than as our present state. To proclaim the unity of God and man now is destructive of morality, and tends to spiritual lethargy; to proclaim the moral unity of God and man as our goal is one of the greatest incentives to spiritual progress. This is no new discovery, but can be seen in Mr. Dewick's admirable survey in almost every age of Christian thought. That Christian people, in spite of the oneness of their hope in Christ, should have expressed themselves in such different ways, with different philosophic backgrounds, is not surprising, and perhaps not to be regretted. The book before us, at any rate introduces us most ably to a study of deep human interest.

L. E. Browne.

THE PHILANTHROPIC MOTIVE IN CHRISTIANITY *

Dr. Hnik is Reader in Christian Social Ethics in the John Huss Faculty at Prague and a leading figure of the Czech Church. Recently he has been a research scholar at Manchester College, Oxford, and Dunkin Lecturer on Christian Sociology. His book is written in excellent English. Its interest lies in the fact that it represents a study of philanthrophy which draws its inspiration from a liberal Christianity of an unusual type, divergent in many points from the traditional doctrines and embodiments. Dr. Hnik's object is to call attention on the one hand to the importance of the religious motive in works of charity, and on the other to stress the necessary prominence of social work in the practice of the Christian religion. He seeks to trace the influence of the spirit of the Christian religion upon the theory and practice of philanthropy. In other words, he wishes to draw out the fact that modern social services are an organic continuation of the care of the Church for the socially depressed, and are explicable only in terms of the

* *The Philanthropic Motive in Christianity*. An Analysis of the Relations between Theology and Social Service. By Frank Martin Hnik, Ph.D., University of Brno, translated from the Czech by R. and M. Weatherall. xii + 328 pp., 8vo. (Basil Blackwell, Oxford. 16/- net. 1938.)

Christian outlook. This was certainly worth demonstrating. It is often overlooked or forgotten that if the Christian motive for philanthropy be removed, much philanthropy immediately collapses, while what remains has its tone and temper very seriously altered, as we see in such countries as Communist Russia and Nazi Germany.

English readers will no doubt be struck by the way in which a continental strives eagerly after a theory to define and justify that which they for several generations have taken for granted, and also by the tendency to equate social work with so-called 'ambulance work.' This of course has been a feature of much Christian thought on the subject from the beginning, partly on account of the emphasis laid upon the 'fallenness' of humanity. But it is by no means an equation which the majority of Christians would to-day accept in this country. The reviewer has actually before him at the moment an episcopally-approved syllabus which contains the following sentence. 'In general—the Church should not confine herself to "ambulance work," but should labour constructively to create a God-controlled social order.'

Dr. Hnik's book is in four parts. In the first he considers the social teaching of the New Testament, in the second the social philosophy of mediaeval Catholicism, and in the third, the social philosophy of the Reformation. So far he treads the path covered previously by Ernst Troeltsch in his much larger work. He is to a great extent dependent on Troeltsch, quotes him, and acknowledges his indebtedness. In so far as he adds to what may be found in the *Soziallehren*, he does so with the aid of Tawney and Bernstein, and from a study of the writings of Richard Baxter. But here comes in the limitation of Dr. Hnik's outlook (it was characteristic of Troeltsch's also). Nothing is said about Counter-Reformation ethics, and nothing whatever about Baxter's contemporary, Jeremy Taylor. Indeed one would almost suppose Baxter to have been typical of the whole English outlook, whereas we know that he was only representative of the Puritans. Some space might well have been allotted to the Caroline moralists, and some to those of the eighteenth century, including Bishop Butler. In the fourth section of his book, the author considers the social philosophy of modern humanitarianism. Here again a sectarian limitation is noticeable, for Dr. Hnik selects William Ellery Channing as the chief exponent of humanitarianism. Now no one would wish to belittle Channing's contribution to American Liberal Christianity, but it is surely true to say that his influence in Britain was negligible, and that his name is almost unknown outside the Unitarian denomination. The effect of this section is to give him a prominence in the history of Christian sociology which he never possessed, and to distort the proportion of the Church History of the nineteenth century. At the same time one is bound to admit that Channing's exposition of Liberal Protestantism has

something typical about it, and in so far as this is the case, Channing's doctrine indicates the source of American liberal idealism, and an important point is made when it is asserted that Channing's disciple, Theodore Parker, created a living conscience which prepared America for the abolition of slavery, by the reiterated assertion of the doctrines of universal brotherhood and of the dignity of man.

I cannot help feeling that Dr. Hnik's survey lacks completeness by its entire omission of all reference to the nineteenth and twentieth century social movements in the Anglican Church. The work of the Evangelicals is dismissed in one line, and there is no mention at all of Maurice, Kingsley, Westcott, Gore, or their followers. Equally the work of C.O.P.E.C. is ignored.

The fourth and last part of the book deals with the social doctrines of Protestant theology as reflected in the new Czecho-Slovakian Church, which achieved an independent existence in 1920. Events which are taking place just as this review is being penned (March, 1939) make the reading of this section a sad one, since no one can tell whether the newly-organized Church may not now be split into sections. It is important, however, to notice that these Reformed Christians have abandoned the Calvinistic ethic, with its emphasis upon the power, anger, and despotism of God, for an ethic more closely related to the Jesus of the Synoptic Gospels, accentuating the justice and mercy of the Loving Heavenly Father. Dr. Hnik also says that they strive for the abolition of poverty, and dissociate themselves from the mediaeval Catholicism which regarded society as incapable of being re-planned ('ambulance work' again!). It would thus appear that the Czechs have so far remained outside the influence of Barthianism, and have also escaped that tendency to association with political conservatism which has rendered German Lutheranism so ineffective in dealing with the working classes.

This is an interesting and unusual book; and its earlier sections, especially that dealing with the roots and fruit of Catholic charity, have gained not a little by being read and criticised in manuscript by Fr. Leslie Walker, S.J., of Campion Hall, Oxford.

A. C. Bouquet.

THE ENGLISH POET OF CHRISTIANITY*

This book has for its purpose more than the vindication of Browning before modern critics: it seeks to show that by his success in writing on matters of great religious, moral and psychological significance he points to what ought to be the normal subjects for poetry. Thus not only Browning but what we might call dialectical poetry is defended. The defence is very ably made, and in making it Miss Kenmare hits several nails roundly on the head; all the more convincingly because her earnestness is sharpened by very occasional touches of humour. She claims that on the three counts

* *Browning and Modern Thought.* By Dallas Kenmare. (Williams & Norgate. 6/-. 1939.)

of realism, ugliness and obscurity, so beloved of many moderns, 'it will not be difficult to prove Browning a master.' Nevertheless one is not quite happy at this defence: leaving aside the self-conscious obscurity of some too-clever modern poets, it might be urged that the obscurity of modern verse is often the obscurity of unfamiliar imagery, not the obscurity of awkward expression. If only we knew what leopards and bones meant to Mr. T. S. Eliot we could understand his *Ash Wednesday* easily enough, whereas Browning is obscure as a rule through twisting and torturing involved thought into a halting rhythm. But the wise reader will not stop there. He will acknowledge the profundity and wide sweep of his thought, which brings him the task of laying out all the complicated and conflicting material of his large themes, and the patient thoroughness with which he works to a triumphant conclusion. His is the method of the greater composers, such as Beethoven, Brahms, Sibelius, and he seldom uses the briefer, far more intense style of a Chopin or a Schumann. Modern poetry (witness the fashion for brevity) is Chopinesque, concerned with feeling far more than with thought. When it tries to think in a form better adapted to the expression of feeling it commits absurdities reminiscent of *Quiet Corners*. That is partly why the modern poet who really has something of more than personal interest to say ought to read his Browning—but not imitate him. Miss Kenmare does not make this point, but it becomes very clear when one has read her book. She begins by seeking to establish the relevance of Browning to modern thought, but is soon engaged on the task of showing that his themes and mind are large enough to be relevant to any thinking which is genuine and serious.

To discharge this task she considers and expounds with considerable insight the more important poems which reveal Browning as the poet of Humanity, of Love, of Art and Nature, and finally of Christianity. Many interesting contributions to the subjects thus raised are added by Miss Kenmare herself, always thoughtful and provocative, not always easy to accept. Thus perhaps the chief criticism which could be made of this book is that there is a tendency to dangerous over-statement. For example, well justified admiration for Browning leads the author to make rather extravagant claims for poets in general:

> 'The poets are the true realists; by virtue of their calling they cannot choose but see reality, not only realism, and are fitted for the task through the high degree of development of the intuitive faculty which see "things unseen."'

It would be more true to say that this faculty is typical of great poets. It could hardly be said, for example, of Walter de la Mare, a poet of fantasy, or—though the remark is admittedly controversial—of Housman, surely undeniably a poet, but a poet of the realism which Miss Kenmare distinguishes from reality. Again, it ought to be made clear that the word 'poet' is being used in the wider sense in which the word 'artist' is sometimes used when it is claimed that 'the poet alone of men attains to full maturity.' Even then, one must of course demur to this statement.

There is surer ground for such a claim as is made on pages 128-9:

> 'The great poet shares with the prophet this gift of assessing final values; he lives not only in the present, but, in some way not rationally explicable, in past, present and future simultaneously. Hence much of his unpopularity: he dismisses as unimportant many things for which the good citizen swears he would give his life. As for the changes in religious thought during Browning's lifetime, his faith was too deeply rooted for this to affect him. "Earth changes, but thy soul

and God stand sure.'' The Christian, firmly rooted and grounded in faith, is not shaken by theological or scientific argument. . . . He is not troubled; the demon of intellectual doubt can never find a way in. Browning was this kind of Christian. . . .'

One might not agree entirely with the way in which this is expressed, but it is well said and needed saying. To it one might add that whereas many men, perhaps most men, go through life seeking God, stopping when they think they have found Him, but often mournfully shaking their heads and hurrying on to renew their search, many of them finally giving it up in resignation, if not despair — it being the unusual experience to succeed in the search — there are others who cannot cast off the company of God, whose unusual experience is to be without Him, who in some black moods would be glad to escape Him, but know, like the Psalmist, the impossibility: 'Whither shall I go then from thy presence?' And Browning, as this book shows, though in the different language just quoted, was one of these latter. Faith—confident action, knowing the companionship of God—is for him a, nay *the,* normal state of mind. Browning's childhood was happy, his marriage an example of what Christian marriage should be; he had few personal troubles; but he is swiftly acquitted of facile optimism. Discussing the famous 'All's right with the world,' Miss Kenmare aptly remarks:

'As well dismiss Browning as an optimist because of Pippa's words as Shakespeare as a pessimist because Hamlet condemned the world as a pestilential congregation of vapours.'

Certainly no serious and impartial person who has read the Browning Love Letters could maintain for a moment that Browning saw life through rose-tinted spectacles, that he was other than a true realist, or that he was without his own acute consciousness of the evil in the world.

As an example of the kind of statement which Miss Kenmare herself contributes by the way in her exposition, and which seems hasty and undigested, we choose her remarks on predestination and freewill. Discussing the words

'The forests had done it; there they stood;
We caught for a moment the powers at play:
They had mingled us so, for once and good,
Their work was done — might go or stay,
They relapsed to their ancient mood,'

she says:

'Such a belief suggests an answer to the problem of predestination and freewill. If God has a plan for each individual life, the issue is decided; there is no alternative. But—and this is the important factor—the individual is of course unaware of the plan, therefore his will is *apparently* "free." He cannot know that the issue is decided, so he always has the *illusion* of choice.'

This is of course no answer to the problem: to be *apparently* free and to have an *illusion* of choice is to be bound as firmly and in precisely the same manner as that described by the fiercest determinist. A smaller matter demanding notice is the statement that 'Jesus, wisest of poets, spoke in parables' because He 'expounded His meaning only to those who were by nature fitted to understand: His chosen disciples.' This is an error. The Gospels are not clear on the point, but the one thing they make clear is that Jesus cannot have chosen His disciples because they were by nature

fitted to understand: it is one of the most salutary lessons to those who think that nothing can be done for the Kingdom of God except by persons of exceptional understanding that He chose people obviously on occasion unbelievably dense. But the main point made here, that the poet and Jesus have in common the necessity to speak without promise of explanation, that both must say 'Who hath ears to hear, let him hear,' is sound.

Miss Kenmare rightly emphasizes the importance of the attraction of many present-day intellectuals towards Christianity and of the successful return to the stage of religious drama (though she ought not to have said that Miss Dorothy Sayers, writer of 'The Zeal of Thy House,' has been known hitherto only for her 'thrillers'—an unkind description of her masterly detective novels!), but when she sees in these happenings signs that 'the Christian revolution may yet come in time to save civilization,' we are bound to shake our heads. That several more acute minds have found in Christianity the answer to the world's problems does not mean that the world is likely to accept that answer, in an age when acute mental insight is not only not valued but passes unnoticed.

An appreciation of Browning has been, as we may know from this book, the means of revealing the fulness of Christ to more than one reader of the poet. Thus, while we cannot share Miss Kenmare's belief that contemporary movements in modern thought are signs of what may happen (believing them to be signs merely of more people wanting certain things to happen), we can heartily recommend this book as an illuminating study of a mind enlightened by faith; and lest any criticism made in this review should suggest an adverse judgment, let it be said at once that in its exposition of Browning it will be able to bring yet more thinkers to a fuller understanding of Christianity. The author will hardly desire any greater success.

A. R. C. Leaney.

THE SWASTIKA*

This little volume contains five essays, one on the relations between Christian and Pagan religious symbols, and the others on the sign *Tau*, the Sacred Fish, the Serpent, and Lucifer and his cult respectively. The essays themselves are very readable, and should make a wide appeal; for they contain much curious and authentic information about matters in which people are interested.

> 'Another form of the cross is the *Crux gammata*, so called because it is a fourfold repetition of the Greek letter *gamma*. It is familiar to us as the *Swastika*, and because it was in use among the Brahman, Buddhist, and other Oriental religions, some writers have endeavoured to establish a connection between them and Christianity. Di Rossi, however, has demonstrated that the *Crux gammata* was no stranger in Western Europe. It is found on Greek coins in Corinth and in Sicily, and in a Mamnite tomb, also in Rome itself. In all probability the Swastika had been introduced into Europe through the rapid spread of the Oriental cults, and Christians availed themselves of it. So we find the Swastika on gravestones in the catacombs, on the robes of Christ and of Diogenes the Fossor—both in the Christian cemetery of Flavia Domatilla, in the Christian cemetery of Antinoe in Egypt, and on the left breast of a mummy of the second half of the third century found at Dehr-el-Bahri, just as it is found in Korea on the

* *Pagan and Christian Symbols.* By the Rev. A. H. Henderson. (Skeffington. 2/-. 1938.)

breast of the Seven Angels of the Presence who surround Buddha's throne.'

The dynamic of symbols is very interesting, and appears to be as strong to-day as ever it was. Mr. Henderson's little book is not only scholarly but topical, and deserves to be widely read. J.C.H.

CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editor of *The Modern Churchman*

HERBERT SPENCER AND MATERIALISM.

SIR,

I am a little sorry that Mr. Handley should have included Herbert Spencer with the Materialists.

Spencer himself again and again protested against this designation and even contended that he was no less religious than his opponents. In his *First Principles* he sought to establish the existence of a First Cause and 'the Power which the Universe manifests.' Some of us have even found him of assistance in building our foundations of religious belief.

Certainly, when he turned for information to the theologians of his day and was faced with a series of crude, dogmatic assertions, some of them self-contradictory, he concluded that God is ultimately unknowable; and Mr. Handley's shock on reading in the *Study of Sociology* Spencer's criticism of certain theological dogmas is most understandable. Small wonder such a conclusion! In Spencer's day there were no Modernist teachers to point a firm way across the morass and separate the grain from its husk.

Oxford. W. A. SMITHE.
May 27th, 1939.

CONVOCATION AND CREMATION.

SIR,

In the report of the proceedings of the Upper House of Convocation published in the *Times* it was stated that the subject of cremation was discussed, and that the House attached no theological significance to the practice. Then it went on to say:

> '*The conviction was also expressed that the practice of cremation does not in any way effect the Church's belief in the resurrection of the body,* and it was pointed out that martyrs who were burned to death did not forfeit their hope of the resurrection of the body.'

Now, Sir, are we to draw the inference that 'the Church's belief in the resurrection of the body' is this, that the temporary material tabernacle of the human soul, after having been dissolved into its constituent elements, is again, at some future date, to be reconstructed and re-animated?

If this inference may legitimately be drawn, then, so it seems to me, this article of the Church's belief should be interpreted in a literal and not a symbolical way.

For many of us it would simply be impossible to do that.

EDWARD H. LEALE, *Vicar* (retired).

Muncaster Lodge, 53 Terminus Avenue, Bexhill-on-Sea.
May 27th, 1939.

[There is not at the present time a single Bishop on the English Bench, under seventy years of age, who believes in the Resurrection of the Body (Flesh), as it was held and taught in the Christian Church from the days of Clement of Rome down to F. D. Maurice. The latter called this doctrine 'a resurrection of relics.'

It is hard to see, in view of the change of Christian thought inaugurated in this country by the publication of Maurice's *Theological Essays* in 1853, why our Bishops persist in retaining so misleading a phrase.—ED., *M.C.*]

EVANGELISM AND THE FILM.

SIR,

In my short article in your April number, I did not touch on the many technical questions involved in the use of religious films in Church, but I will gladly attempt to deal with the points raised by the Rev. D. A. Foster.

1. Personally I can see no objection to the use of films in Church where no Sunday opening of cinemas is permitted. We are not attempting to compete with the cinemas. Their aim is that of commercial success in providing entertainment. Ours is that of instruction and edification, and involves neither Sunday labour nor private profit. It is simply the old lantern service with a vastly better technique. As all religious films are non-flammable, there is no question of a licence from the authorities.

2. The cost of a projector is considerable, but the Religious Film Society makes grants towards this initial expense. With the help of their grant, our projector and screen cost only £52. The cost of hiring films is about 5/- per reel for sound and 2/6 for silent, and can be more than covered by a retiring collection. We have always doubled, and sometimes trebled, our evening congregation when showing films, and finance presents no difficulty. The R.F.S. offers a trial of a projector before purchase at a cost of £2 2*s.* 0*d.*, the fee forming part of the price if it is decided to purchase. The Church Council could be invited to this, to overcome their prejudices and to demonstrate the value of this method of appeal. Also some buildings are unsuitable for sound films, and a test would reveal this.

A projector is of great value in Parish work for missionary gatherings, children's parties, etc., apart from use in Church.

3. We find no difficulty in placing the projector in the centre aisle. It needs a firm stand, being seventy pounds in weight, but is only the size of a suitcase, and runs quite silently. This is very important. Some projectors give a 'purring' sound, which would spoil the atmosphere of the service. We have the screen rolled up on the chancel screen during Evening Prayer. During the last verse of the offertory hymn the choir recesses to the front pews and the screen is lowered. We sometimes use the lantern as well to throw a slide on the screen (e.g. Holman Hunt's 'Light of the World'), while the projector, which has been 'laced up' before the service, is set in motion. Our experience proves that, with care and forethought, the film can become part of a dignified Anglican Service.

The Religious Film Society, 104 High Holborn, W.C.1, will gladly give advice on such matters.

T. H. W. MAXFIELD.

St. Saviour's Vicarage, Grove Hill Road, London, S.E.5.
May 26th, 1939.

CIVILIZATION AND THE CHRISTIAN METAPHYSIC.

SIR,

If I understand Mr. Edwin V. Milner's letter, I am not surprised that he finds, as he says, 'many churchmen, including Modernists, seem to regard his belief with something akin to horror' and 'hold it subversive of Christian morality.' In reply to the question 'How do we know God's Will?' Mr. Milner's answer is 'simply that God's Will has no limits; that He is, in the words of Spinoza, "the effective cause of all that is."' Of course, those who accept Spinoza's pantheistic position will find his conclusion perfectly logical — whatever is must be in accordance with God's Will. But I understand that the Christian belief is that men are in some sense *elohim,* that is, beings separate from God, and possessing the godlike attribute of free-will. So if they err, we cannot 'see God as responsible for sin' or treat the sinner 'as the product of nature or nurture, or hereditary defects, abnormal glandular secretions, etc.,' because we believe he could, with the help of God's grace, overcome these disabilities by the exercise of his free-will, and so if he does not, 'he is to be blamed.'

E. E. BRADFORD, D.D.

Nordelph Vicarage, Downham Market, Norfolk.

EMPIRICAL LIGHT ON THE INDIVIDUAL.

SIR,

In his challenging article entitled 'Reinstating the Individual,'* Mr. J. C. Hardwick considers the importance of the individual from many points of view. Both in art and religion, he says, it is through the individual that reality is manifested. And one may surely add that physical science, in spite of its claim to be impersonal, has now come to recognize that all its truths are mediated through the observer. Totalitarianism in the social sphere, and anthropology, biology and genetics have also, he tells us, from their respective points of view attacked the claims of the individual; and now psychology comes to deliver the *coup de grâce* by denying the notion that man is a rational being at all.

Yet it is from a close ally of psychology—scientific psychical research—that the most cogent evidence comes in support of the individual's claims. We are reminded that we must not be afraid of being empirical; that we must not rely altogether on *a priori* arguments to support the philosophy of the individual. We must take into account all relevant facts, great and small, sublime or trivial, which have a bearing on individual character. Apart altogether from the unfortunate cloud of superstition which has collected about the obscure faculties of the human mind, there exists a large mass of evidence of a strictly scientific kind (this is largely the work of the English Society for Psychical Research during more than half a century) clearly marked off from nebulosity and superstition, which places beyond all doubt the existence of certain wide faculties of perception and of certain phases of human personality, which may be called 'extra- or super-normal.' It has not yet been appreciated how vast is the significance of these faculties and these mental states for the understanding of the human individual, how unique is the opportunity they provide for exploring beneath the surface or how deeply they cut into the roots of religion, philosophy and science. This significance only begins to be appreciated when it is realised that no physical explanation of extra-normal faculties is pos-

* *The Modern Churchman,* March, 1939.

sible. Telepathy, for example, is not a communication from point to point in space or from one brain to another. Any explanation which seeks to account for telepathy on physical lines breaks down when considered in detail. All the evidence points to it as being some form of purely mental relationship, which is incompatible with the view of individual atomism. It does not even seem to be possible to confine it within the limits of a temporal process, since there is an astonishing weight of evidence for the existence of foreknowledge. And if foreknowledge is possible, what becomes of that foundation of all science, the Law of Causality? Cause, as we understand it, works only forwards in time. Once this extra-normal faculty of perception is granted, we are forced to admit that science has no niche in which to place it.

Yet, from all this evidence, the majority of educated minds turn away. Often they pretend that it is trivial, but anyone who thinks that such facts as these are trivial will think the Day of Judgment trivial. This great searchlight on the central importance of the individual is hidden to the majority because their eyes are psychologically blinded to it. Psychology has demonstrated that beliefs instilled in childhood as a rule continue to be held through life. But the interesting fact is that they are not often held as *rationally considered opinions*: they persist as *psychologically ingrained suggestions,* which may be completely at variance with the rational outlook of the mind as a whole. They are the effect of psychological *causes,* not the result of rational conviction. Many, professing implicit belief in the miracles of the past, will reject with ridicule evidence for alleged miracles to-day, even though the latter evidence be far the stronger. Nor can one fail to be struck by the fact that a man who regards his own religious background as obviously true will reject the religious background of another as not worth five minutes' consideration. His own is entrenched in psychological habit; but he brings reason to bear on another's.

The psychological resistance to facts of an extra-normal kind is, however, of a still more deeply rooted character. An eminent thinker, while remarking that most scientists and the bulk of the general public will not for a moment admit the overwhelming evidence which exists for telepathy, caustically said: 'We know that this is not because they have looked into the evidence and found it faulty or have suggested plausible alternative explanations. They would no more think of looking into the evidence for telepathy than a pious Christian thinks of looking into the evidence for Mahometanism, or a pious Mahometan of looking into the evidence for Christianity.'

Here is a fact as significant for psychical research as it is for religion. The human mind is divided into water-tight compartments, whose partitions are sealed by psychological habit. To some extent the psychologist is right when he says that man is not a rational being. Man is only rational in parts. Reason plays fitfully above the primordial beliefs of instinct, some of which have been inculcated by nature for purely practical ends. Such is the belief in that practical realism, which convinces us of the finality of the sense-perceived world. The belief is a biological necessity. Out of it arise the basic categories of thought and fundamental convictions about space, time and matter, which are the most strongly entrenched psychological suggestions we have. Out of it also arises the perennial return to some form of Materialism. Psychical research shatters these convictions at a blow, or, rather, relegates them to the realm of appearances — a conception which the untutored mind cannot grasp. Here we find the chief reason why psychical research, with all the light which it is capable of shedding on human individuality, is a rejected science to-day.

Neither is it a matter only of extra-normal perceptual faculties. Phases of personality begin to be revealed which point to further vistas beyond. There is a region of question-marks. The conceptions we bring to the problems do not fit. Like the teachers of the East, we are obliged to say: 'Not so; not so!' Our intellectual stock-in-trade is insufficient. If human atomism is not endorsed by the facts on the one hand, neither is the idea that we are scraps of pan-consciousness on the other. We are forced to admit that we have no idea of what it is which constitutes self-identity.

If the empirical method takes us so quickly beyond our intellectual depth, what greater paradox could there be than to seek for profounder truth by returning to the conventional shallows? The progress of mankind lies now in attacking the *internal* environment; in breaking down the water-tight compartments of the mind and in trying to realise something of the key position which the human individual occupies.

32A Harrington Gardens, S.W.7. G. N. M. TYRELL.

SIR CHARLES MARSTON ON PENTATEUCHAL CRITICISM.

SIR,

I, in common with the rest of the clergy, have received a copy of the last chapter of Sir Charles Marston's book, *The Bible Comes Alive*. The pith of its contents seems to lie in the following words:

> 'Again, the Mosaic Legislation and Ritual fit so naturally into the age of Moses as it is now revealed to us by Archaeology that it has become ridiculous to date them to any other period than the one in which the Bible represents them to have been instituted.
>
> The effect of these discoveries is to further discredit the whole process of destructive criticism. Archaeology, a strictly objective science, is disproving the subjective negations spun from the mentality of critics.'

Would it be possible for you to publish an entirely non-technical article showing (i) what the discoveries since the war amount to, and (ii) what is their bearing upon our view of the Old Testament? What I have in mind is an article that we Modernist clergymen could put into the hands of those of our flocks who are interested in such matters, and who, lacking knowledge, are most apt to be affected by the above-mentioned book.

Mitford Vicarage, Morpeth. J. D. CALDWELL.

3rd June, 1939.

[We venture to commend Professor Hooke's booklet, *Archaeology and the Old Testament* (M.C. Series, published by Thomas Murby, price 6*d*., 1939). This whole series, *After Four Hundred Years*, is of great value for the parochial clergy.—ED., *M.C.*]

CORRECTION.

In our May issue, p. 101, we wrongly assigned to George Crabbe the description of the poor woman who knew, and only knew, her Bible true. We ought to have assigned it to William Cowper:—

> 'She, for her humble sphere by nature fit,
> has little understanding and no wit;
> Receives no praise, but though her lot be such,
> toilsome and indigent, she renders much;
> Just knows, and knows no more, her Bible true,
> a truth the brilliant Frenchman never knew.' (*Truth*.)